4.8.79

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, N. J.

Green Fund

BT 767.3 .G66 1834
Goode, William, 1801-1868.
The modern claims to the
possession of the

THE

MODERN CLAIMS

TO THE POSSESSION OF THE EXTRAORDINARY

GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT,

STATED AND EXAMINED;

AND COMPARED WITH

THE MOST REMARKABLE CASES OF A SIMILAR KIND THAT HAVE OCCURRED IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH:

WITH

SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE SUBJECT.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM GOODE, A. M.

OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; CURATE OF CHRIST CHURCH WITH ST. LEONARD FOSTER, AND LECTURER OF ST. MARY WOOLNOTH, LONDON.

Second Edition.

WITH NUMEROUS ADDITIONS, AND

AN APPENDIX

ON THE HERESY WITH WHICH THE CLAIMS ARE CONNECTED.

"Some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end."—DAN. xi. 35.

"Pontius fecit miraculum, et Donatus oravit et respondit ei Deus de cœlo. Primò, aut falluntur, aut fallunt. Postremò, fac illum montes transferre. Caritatem autem, inquit, non habeam, nihil sum. . . . *Contra istos, ut sic loquar, mirabiliarios cautum me fecit Deus meus*, dicens, In novissimis temporibus exsurgent pseudoprophetæ . . . . . Ergo cautos nos fecit Sponsus, quia et miraculis decipi non debemus."—AUGUSTIN. *In Joh. Evang.* c. iii. Tract. xiii. §. 17.

"Christians should never fail to do now what they then [*i. e.* in the time of the Montanists] did,—namely, they should *examine, expose, condemn, and separate themselves from such delusions*."—MILNER's *Hist. of the Church of Christ*, vol. i. p. 261.

LONDON:

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY;

J. & J. J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE; J. PARKER, OXFORD;

W. WHYTE AND CO., EDINBURGH;

AND W. CURRY, JUN., AND CO., DUBLIN.

1834.

573

LONDON:
IBOTSON AND PALMER, PRINTERS, SAVOY STREET, STRAND.

PREFACE

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

For the reception with which the former edition of this work has been favoured,* the Author begs here to offer his best acknowledgments; nor can he omit to express in this place the thankfulness with which he has learnt, that it has been in many instances made instrumental in removing the doubts and settling the minds of those who had been wavering on the subject of which it treats.

As it respects those who have fully embraced the delusion, he has little hope that anything he can offer will be of any avail. With such persons arguments are seldom of any use, because, however forcible, they are at once put aside by a reference to what is assumed to be "the voice of God." Where this assumption, then, involving as it does the very chief point in dispute, is made the groundwork of the argument, the case is hopeless, and arguments are thrown away.

* See British Magazine for July 1833; Gentleman's Magazine for July, (Suppl.) 1833; Christian Guardian for July, 1833, and Feb. 1834; Evangelical Magazine for September, 1833; H. Blunt's Discourses on the Trial of the Spirits; Christian Observer for December, 1833; British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review for Jan., 1834; M'Neile's Letters to a Friend, pp. 127, 8; &c.

The principal points to which the writer wishes to call attention in the following pages, and which, as he conceives, must, if proved, at once settle the question with respect to the modern claims to the possession of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, are these two; viz. first, the dissimilarity between the characteristics of the supposed gifts of the present day, and those of the scriptural prophets; and, secondly, the remarkable similarity between them and those of the various false pretenders to such endowments in the past ages of the Christian Church. To the discussion of these points he has subjoined some observations on the general character and tendency of such claims, and the arguments by which they are usually supported.

In his examination of these claims he has considered them quite independently of the doctrines with which they are connected in the present day, because however closely associated the two may be in the persons of the present claimants, they are quite distinct from each other, and may at any time exist independently of each other. Finding, however, that there existed much misapprehension even among many of the followers of the party, as to the real nature of those doctrines, he has now added an *Appendix* upon that subject.

The close connexion between those doctrines and the supposed gifts in the present case is remarkably shown in an extract given in this edition, in the first chapter, from a paper by Mr. Irving, in Fraser's Magazine for January, March, and April, 1832, to which I would beg the reader's *particular attention.* THE FIRST RISE OF THE GIFTS IN SCOTLAND MR. IRVING HIMSELF HAS THERE TRACED TO, AND CLEARLY SHOWN TO HAVE BEEN THE EFFECT OF, INSTRUCTIONS AND EXHORTATIONS RECEIVED THROUGH HIS MISSIONARY on the doctrines he had been for some time preaching in London respecting the human nature of our Lord, united, of course, with his views of the responsibility of the

Church for the possession of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit.

In this edition, besides the Appendix, the author has made very numerous additions in the body of the work, and, following the suggestion offered in one of the reviews, has added at the commencement an analytical *Table of Contents*, which will enable the reader to see at one view the plan and arrangement of the work, and turn at once to the part in which any particular point is discussed. Feeling, however, the importance of compression on such a subject, he has abstained from enlarging further than seemed necessary. The number of parallel cases, in particular, from the past history of the Church might have been much increased. So numerous, indeed, are the cases *on record* of *a similar kind*, that their bare *enumeration* probably would fill a volume equal to this. Enough, however, he trusts, have been given for the satisfaction of the reader, and the references to be found in the notes will easily enable any one to add to their number. To him their testimony appears most important; than which, indeed, if carefully and impartially considered, nothing seems better calculated to disabuse the minds of such as are inclined to waver on the subject, and open the eyes of those who have become parties to the present delusion, to the precipice upon which they are standing.

The common ecclesiastical historians have, in general, naturally, though perhaps not wisely, drawn a veil over such scenes, so that when such pretensions spring up in the Church, they appear to the great body of its members as something new and extraordinary. If accompanied with but the usual degree of plausibility which commonly characterizes them, they present to those who are not *fully* aware how continually such things have occurred in the Church, difficulties which they are not, and cannot be expected to be, altogether prepared to meet.

When there suddenly rise up in the Church those who, with a high moral character, and all the appearances of sincerity, zeal, and religious devotedness, profess to have received the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, admonish men against Satan, preach Christ, and urge upon the Church the duty and necessity of seeking higher powers and attainments, it seems to Christians in general a harsh and improbable supposition, to imagine that Satan can have had any hand in bringing about such an occurrence.

But when we turn to facts, and ascertain that such cases have been constantly occurring in the Church, and confessedly due, if not to satanic power, yet certainly to nothing more than human enthusiasm, or excitement, under satanic influence, the charm is dissolved, the only evidences upon which the delusion stands at once dissipated, and we are able to estimate it at its real value. He who knows how often, and how perfectly, Satan has acted his part, as an angel of light, in producing such delusions, will want nothing further to prepare him for their recurrence, with all the plausibility with which the subtile ingenuity and supernatural power of the great enemy can invest them.

There is one observation, however, which I wish to make here respecting the application to be made of past cases of an apparently similar kind. It has been supposed that the great object in mentioning those cases was to lead to the inference—such cases have happened before, and come to nothing, and therefore this will too. Now, however probable this inference may be, it is not the great object in noticing these cases to lead to it. The object is this. This case is attended with circumstances which appear to many of a very extraordinary nature, such as they suppose could be produced only by the power of God, and which thus generate in them a belief that persons exhibiting such signs must be divinely-commissioned. Now if all the evidences of this kind with which it is accompanied can be

proved to have attended cases of *known delusion, this* ground is completely taken away from under it. And if we prove still further, that *the characteristics* attending this case are such as have usually attended cases of delusion in past times, and are not such as distinguished the prophets of Scripture, then I ask, What ground is there left upon which their claims can stand? Hence the importance of such cases as those we have detailed in this volume.

There are few, however, comparatively, who, even in matters of the highest moment, will bestow any labour of thought or investigation upon the grounds of their assent to that which has impressed their feelings or pleased their fancy. Carefully to sift the evidences upon which that assent is given, is to most but an irksome task, while to indulge their "internal feelings," and find themselves surrounded by all the charms of what is new, strange, and mysterious, is naturally pleasing to them. They, therefore, who have embraced the delusion, are generally inclined, on many accounts, to shift the ground of proof from external evidences to something which is internal, some passive impression in its favour existing in their own breasts. To rest such a matter upon internal feelings, however, is a mere self-deception, for which every rational being will be fearfully responsible. They who make the understanding, the best gift of God to man, take too low a place, are as guilty as they who give it undue authority.

It is true there may be some who may be unequal to such a full investigation of the subject and examination of the evidences on which the matter must be determined, as are necessary to enable them to form an independent decision. But I ask such, Upon which will you prefer to rely,—the testimony of a few isolated enthusiasts, or that of the whole Christian Church?

There are two points to which, as having been developed, since the last edition of this work was published, so

much more strongly than before, I wish here particularly to point the attention of the reader. One is, the *want of unanimity and consistency* in the present claimants to the prophetic office in the very points that most nearly affect the character of their pretensions, namely, the *matter* and the *manner* of their supposed revelations. On this, however, having noticed it in another place, (see pp. 270, 271,) I shall not here enlarge. The other is, the *secresy* enjoined by the supposed spirit with respect to the prophecies uttered, which are now studiously concealed from the Christian public, and communicated only to the party; and a justification of this course attempted, by a reference to the caution exhibited by the primitive Christians towards the *pagans*, in the disclosure of some of their doctrines and rites. How far the cases are parallel, it may be safely left to the reader to judge, and I shall only observe that this spirit is very different from that which revealed the Scriptures, and very like that which loveth darkness and hateth the light. But the *prudence* of the step is unquestionable.

In conclusion, I wish again to observe what I stated in the last edition, that I have given the quotations and remarks in the notes, not, as I can truly say, for any purpose of display, but for the satisfaction of those who may wish to consult the original passages. Nothing, however, occurs in the text which can create a difficulty in the way of the general reader,—and, certainly, of any who can feel authorized to pass a judgment, in opposition to the opinions of the whole Christian Church, in favour of these claims.

It is the Author's earnest wish to approach the subject as one of a most sacred nature, and with fervent prayer for divine guidance; and he must add, that he is not conscious of being actuated by those feelings which have been so freely and confidently ascribed to all those who have ventured to oppose the present pretensions. To arguments derived from such a source, it is impossible to reply but by a

denial; and the impartial reader, who is capable of discerning argument from assertion, will attach no weight to them. If he has any where spoken in what may be thought a strong manner, he trusts it has only been in the view of impressing more deeply upon the reader a caution against notions which appear to him most unscriptural and dangerous, and not with an unkind or *light* feeling towards those who hold them.

It is a favourite argument with the defenders of the present claims, as it has generally been in such cases, that because unbelievers and the great body of professing Christians agree to oppose them, *therefore* these professing Christians must be little better than infidels, constituting "a mass of formality and hypocrisy," and so forth. This appears to the writer to be a two-edged weapon, as dangerous to the assailant as to his opponent. For if this argument holds good, our prophetic claimants themselves must be classed with those unbelievers, for they quite as much agree with them in their condemnation of the Christian Church, and in calling its members, and especially its ministers, hypocrites, as the Christian Church agrees with infidels in rejecting their claims. The truth is, that the sneers of the infidel, being directed against both, prove nothing, for or against either.

Almost all that has been written upon this subject in the "Morning Watch," and other similar publications,[1] is merely (though, as it is clear, unconsciously, as far as the authors are concerned, and therefore the more remarkable) a repetition of what has been said over and over again in former cases of a similar kind, especially in that of the French and English prophets about a century ago. The very same accusations against Christians generally, the

[1] See particularly the Preface to the reprint of "The General Delusion of Christians," &c. 1832. 8vo.

same denunciations against the great body of ministers, as false teachers, and averse to the manifestation of Christ in his glory upon earth, because they will not preach his speedy and personal reign, are to be found almost word for word in the warnings of those false prophets.

The author is aware, that there is some difference of opinion as to the degree of notice which such pretensions merit; but to him they appear to be subjects not lightly to be passed over in the hope that they may sink into oblivion, and thus be left to reappear in a few years with all the charms of novelty; but delusions which, whenever and in whatever form they may show themselves, it is important, as the excellent Milner observes, to "examine, expose, and condemn;" and the more so as time advances, and the probability of such claimants rising up increases.

In this view he has ventured to offer the following remarks on the claims of the present day. And may that Holy Spirit, the nature of whose operations forms the subject of the following pages, guide both the reader and the writer into all truth.

London, July, 1834.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ALLEGED GIFTS.

	Page
Introductory observations on the necessity of caution in admitting such claims	1—10
Human infirmity	1
The warnings of our Lord as to false prophets	1, 2
The revival of the gift of prophecy under this dispensation neither promised nor to be reconciled with Scripture	2, 3
Real miracles insufficient evidence of a divine commission	3, 4
Mistakes easy on the subject of miracles	4
That sincerity, piety, and prayer, do not always preserve men from delusion in such matters	4—6
The opinions of Augustine and Chrysostom on the question, whether the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit are so promised that the Church is responsible for the possession of them, or that they are the legitimate objects of the believer's desires and prayers	6—9
The circumstances connected with the rise of the claims under consideration	10—16
Accounts of the manifestations from various sources, showing the nature and characteristics of the alleged gifts	17—47
Statement of their characteristics as deduced from those accounts	47—49

CHAPTER II.

THE TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE AND THE BEST WRITERS RESPECTING SUCH GIFTS.

Page

1. Women forbidden to speak in the church . 50—53
2. The tongues spoken by the apostles and primitive Christians by the Spirit were real languages of this world . . . . . 53—55
3. The languages spoken by the aid of the Spirit were only to be spoken to those who either understood them, or had one among them who could interpret them to the hearers 55, 56
4. The apostles and primitive Christians, when speaking in a tongue given them by the Spirit, always understood themselves what they uttered . . 57—68
   and had no constraining power acting upon their bodily organs when thus speaking . . 68, 69
5. The scriptural prophets always spoke as perfectly free agents, and without any the least constraint upon their organs of speech, with a full consciousness of the literal meaning of what they said, and able both when receiving and delivering a prophecy, to exercise their reasoning faculties upon it, their minds being used as instruments for the conveyance of the message . . . . . 69—102

That there was no constraining influence upon their bodily organs, producing an utterance of their prophecies . . . . . 71—74

That they were always conscious of the general meaning of the prophecies they uttered, and were able, when receiving and delivering them, to exercise their reasoning faculties upon them . 74—95

The *general meaning* not intended to include the full *prophetic* signification . . 75, 76

Revelations by *vision* . . . . 77—80

——————— — *word* . . . 80—83

When given through the medium of the bodily senses 83, 84

When impressed immediately upon the mind 84

When given during a state of sleep . . 84, 85

When given during a state of ecstasy . 85—89

Testimonies of the Fathers and others on the subject . . . . 89—95

That there was an instrumental intervention of their minds in the conveyance of the message . 95—102

Page

Answer to an argument on this subject made use of by the Editor of "The General Delusion of Christians" 103

CHAPTER III.

THE CASE OF THE MONTANISTS.

Account of the Montanists by a contemporary author preserved in Eusebius . . . . 105—108

Determination from this and other statements respecting them of the real nature and characteristics of their supposed gifts . . . . . 109—113

The sentiments of the primitive Church respecting them 114—144

The testimony of,

Apolinarius, Bishop of Hierapolis . . 114, 115
A Synod of twenty-six Bishops at Hierapolis . 115
The Confessors of Lyons, in France . . 116
Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons . . . 117
Sotas, Bishop of Anchialus . . . 117
Miltiades 118
Rhodon 118
Sarapion and several other Bishops . 118, 119
Clement of Alexandria . . . 119, 120
Apollonius 120
Origen . . . . . 121—125
Firmilian of Cæsarea 125
Eusebius 126
The Book of Canons of the Universal Church . 126, 127
Cyril of Jerusalem . . . 127, 128
Athanasius of Alexandria . . . 128
Hilary of Poictiers . . . 128
Basil the Great 129, 130
Epiphanius of Constantia . . . 131, 132
Gregory of Nazianzum 133
An author said to be Ambrose of Milan . . 133, 134
Hilary the Deacon . . . 134—136
John Chrysostom . . . 136, 137
Augustine 138, 139
Jerome . . . . . 139—142
Vincentius of Lerins . . . 142, 143
Theodorit 143
Gregory the Great 143, 144

Page

Their claims united with general correctness of doctrine in other respects . . . 144—147
And with remarkable strictness of discipline . 147, 148
And sanctioned by the approval of several eminent persons whose sincerity is beyond suspicion . 148
The sect lasted for more than two centuries 149, 150
The great stress laid upon their own testimony as evidence of their inspiration . . . 150
The notice of the Montanists in the "General Delusion of Christians" 151
Mr. Lee's "Treatise on Montanism" . . 151, 152
Importance of the case connected with the subject of this work 152

CHAPTER IV.

VARIOUS SIMILAR CASES SINCE THE MONTANISTS.

A case mentioned by Firmilian . . 153—155
The case of Elizabeth Barton . . . 155, 156
The celestial prophets of Germany . . 156—159
Two cases mentioned by Casaubon and Nider . 159, 160
The Ursaline prophetesses . . . 160
Various cases . . . 161
The remarkable cases of Kotter, Poniatowsky, and Drabicius . . . . 161—169
The Camisars, or French and English prophets . 169—196
The Shakers . . . . 197—203
Observations on the principal marks by which such pretenders have usually been distinguished, with other illustrative cases and examples . . 203—227
Their *mode* of speaking . . . 203—205
Their professed utterance of languages previously unknown to them . . . 205—213
Their pretensions to the power of working miracles 213—215
Their apparent sincerity and piety, and the respectability of some of their followers . . 215, 216
Their fluency and power in prayer and preaching . 216, 217
Their bitterly exclusive spirit and self-confidence . 217
The identity of their prophetic message, viz. the nearness of the second advent of Christ and of the millennium, or of the end of the world . . 217—227

CHAPTER V.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE WHOLE SUBJECT.

	Page
Recapitulation of evidence in chap. II, III, and IV.	228
The sufficiency of natural causes to produce their raptures and extraordinary mode of utterance .	228—239
Observations on the confirmatory signs exhibited in evidence of their mission, or rather the complete want of them	239—241
How far miracles would substantiate their claims .	241—246
Miracles, however great, insufficient proofs in themselves of a divine mission . .	241, 242
The test of divine miracles . . .	243, 244
The value of the evidence afforded by miracles .	245
The inconsistency of Mr. Irving on this point .	245, 246
Answer to the argument founded upon their sincerity and piety	246—255
Answer to the argument founded upon their unusual fluency and power in prayer, preaching, &c. .	255—263
Answer to the argument founded upon the internal witness in their favour felt by their followers .	263—265
Notice of various criteria for judging of true prophets —such as their *spirit* and *language*, &c. with an application of them to the case of the present claimants	265—271
Miraculous powers have long ceased to be legitimate objects of expectation to the Christian Church .	271—277
Not given to all in the primitive Church .	272
The fact of their cessation granted by Mr. Irving .	273
The great object of their original bestowal long since answered . . .	274
Testimonies to this effect from the primitive Fathers	275—277
The improbability of a revival of the gift of prophecy under the present dispensation . .	277—280
Desires for extraordinary gifts and powers not the characteristics of real spirituality of mind . .	280—285
The pernicious effects and consequences of such delusions	285—290

APPENDIX.

ON THE HERESY WITH WHICH THE CLAIMS ARE CONNECTED.

CHAPTER I.

THE NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ALLEGED GIFTS.

THERE is in the mind of man a natural love of what is marvellous. To witness, therefore, an extraordinary display of divine power, and still more, to be an instrument in the exhibition of it, are matters in which the natural feelings of every man find delight apart from any consideration of the ends and purposes of the manifestation. Moreover, to be an agent in such a work, is an office so flattering to the pride of man, tending to lead even an apostle to be "exalted above measure," that ambition alone is sufficient to induce any man to desire it, especially where the idea has been conceived that it is a proper object of desire. There are many reasons, therefore, arguing only from what we know of the human mind, to induce us to regard with very considerable caution, and investigate very narrowly, the claims of those who profess to be endowed with the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit.

Of the necessity of caution in admitting such pretensions, we are still more forcibly reminded by the warnings given us in Scripture, that many claims of this kind will be advanced by those who have no divine commission. Our Lord plainly admonished his followers that there would arise in the Church many false prophets who would show great signs, so as to deceive, if it were possible, even the elect: (Matt. xxiv. 24; Mark xiii. 22:) nay, that many among his professed followers, and esteeming themselves

his children, would say to him in the day of judgment, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name have cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works?" to whom he would say, "I never knew you." (Matt. vii. 22, 23.) And by St. John, he again warns the Church that there would rise up in the latter times those who would "do great wonders," and "deceive" many. (Rev. xiii. 13, 14.) "That is particularly important," says Augustine, "that we should not be deceived in our research after truth, *not only* by the name of Christ through those who possess the Christian name but not the works, *but also* by some certain works and miracles; which when the Lord did, for the sake of the unbelieving, he warned us nevertheless that we should not be deceived by such things, supposing that the invisible wisdom is present there wherever we see the visible miracle. Therefore he adds also this declaration: 'Many shall say to me in that day,' &c. [Matt. vii. 22, 23.] . . . . For he forbad even his disciples to rejoice in such things, that is, that the devils were subject to them, but rejoice, he says, because your names are written in heaven. [Luke x. 20.]"[1]

And with these warnings are coupled *no promises* either of our Lord or his apostles, that there shall be in these days *any true prophets*. There is no passage in the New Testament that gives us any ground to expect a renewal of the gift of prophecy in these days. Nay, as to that particular point which most of the self-styled prophets of the last several hundred years have made the especial subject of their premonitions, the second coming of our Lord, we have

[1] "Atque illud ad rem maxime pertinet ne decipiamur tendentes ad contemplationem veritatis, non solum nomine Christi, per eos qui nomen habent et facta non habent, sed etiam quibusdam factis atque miraculis; qualia propter infideles cum fecerit Dominus, monuit tamen ne talibus decipiamur, arbitrantes ibi esse invisibilem sapientiam ubi miraculum visibile viderimus. Adjungit ergo et dicit *multi mihi dicent*, &c. [Matt. vii. 22, 33.] . . . . .; Nam et ipsos discipulos suos prohibuit gaudere de talibus, id est, quod dæmonia illis subjecta fuerint, sed gaudete inquit, &c. [Luke x. 20.]"—August. De Serm. Dom. in Monte, lib. 2. ad fin. Ed. Ben. vol. 3. p. 2. col. 235.

our Lord's testimony that the time will not be known by his own servants; for he says *to his disciples*, "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour *your* Lord doth come . . . in such an hour as *ye think not* the Son of man cometh." (Matt. xxiv. 42, 44.) And as it respects the prophecy of Joel, sometimes quoted as if it referred to the present time, we have St. Peter's testimony that it was fulfilled at the great Pentecostal effusion of the Spirit; (Acts ii. 16—18;) so that to expect any second fulfilment of it in these days is, to say the least, to build upon a totally insufficient foundation, when neither our Lord nor his apostles offer any thing confirmatory of such an expectation.

We have also, it must be remarked, in the passages quoted above, indisputable evidence that real miracles may be derived from other than a divine source. The power of Satan no doubt exceeds very considerably the power of man, and whomsoever he has deceived by clothing himself as an angel of light, it may answer his purpose in various ways, to enable such a person to imitate the wonderful works of God, and exhibit both in his own person and upon the persons of others, the possession of supernatural powers.

It is not, therefore, a sufficient evidence of a divine miracle, that a thing has been accomplished which needed more than human power to effect. Hence, when our Lord was charged with casting out devils by Beelzebub, he does not refer the Jews to the greatness even of *his* miracles, (many of which were far beyond Satan's power to effect,) to disprove it, but to the fact that his miracles had been directed to the overthrow of Satan's kingdom, and hence could not have been performed by his help, for otherwise Satan would be divided against himself. How far his power may extend, indeed, it is impossible for us to conjecture with any sort of precision, although, by aid of Scripture and experience, we might perhaps be able to affix to it some probable limits. It is evident, however, that he possesses considerable power, and it is sufficient for our present purpose to know, that he is able to produce miracles so much like those which have been wrought at various times

by divine power, that the difference can scarcely and with difficulty be discerned by the true children of God. Thus much, then, we may observe with respect to real miracles, that it is not merely because they are beyond the power of man to effect, that we must conclude them to be divine; but it must also be shown, that they are such as from some cause or other would not or could not have been produced by the power of Satan. To this end, therefore, it is above all things necessary, (to mention only one point,) that *as far as we are able to judge*, they should be utterly disconnected with all unscriptural doctrine in the persons of those who exhibit or perform them—*a test to which our Lord himself condescends to bow with submission.* (John v. 38, 39.) And to this test must be added, as we shall hereafter have occasion to observe, several others.

It is probable, however, that a competent knowledge of human nature would show us that many things that have been deemed miraculous and supernatural, may readily be accounted for as merely natural phenomena, and, in fact, fall into the mere ordinary course of events. It is quite certain, and I think will be allowed on all hands, that in some of the facts hereafter mentioned, and which for the time were considered as divine miracles, one of these two conclusions *must* be resorted to, either that they are natural though unusual phenomena, or that they were the effects of diabolical agency; and if the reader prefer the latter supposition from being unable to realize the truth of the former, he would probably in many cases at least be not far from the truth.

But although these remarks may be considered true as relating either to men given up wholly to the power of Satan, or to those whose religion is *merely* the effect of natural enthusiasm, yet there is often a doubt as to their applicability to the case of persons to all appearance sincere and pious.

It seems to be taken for granted, by some, and indeed is generally the great stumbling-block in cases like that we are about to consider, that God will not allow his sincere

worshippers to be deceived by such false appearances, much less to become actors in them; and it has even been urged, that because God has promised to answer prayer, it is unreasonable to suppose that if the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit are asked of God, he would deceive the person by false appearances, and thereby send a stone instead of bread; and that "if we were to ask anything unworthy of him to grant, or harmful to ourselves to receive, he would withhold it."[2] These objections will be more fully considered hereafter, when the evidence of the facts we are about to mention will enable us to meet them more satisfactorily; but for the present let us only consider how far they are warranted either by Scripture or analogy. Have we any reason to suppose that good men must certainly be preserved from every such delusion, while we know that they are not preserved from all doctrinal error, nor even from all open sin? And as to the latter point, I would ask, Has not God himself set limitations to our expectations from him, and said, that it is only when we ask *according to his will* that he hears us? It is therefore incumbent upon those who use this argument, to prove that such a petition is agreeable to the Divine will, against the almost universal consent of the Church of God in all ages, that it is foolish and presumptuous.[3] Otherwise they must themselves allow that such a state of mind is *itself* a state of delusion. Let not such, then, when tempted to believe spurious miracles, say that they are tempted of God to do so, when they are drawn away of their own unwarrantable

[2] This argument is urged by Mr. Irving as "quite decisive" on the point. See Fraser's Mag. for April, 1832.

[3] Thus it is said of those who pray for revelations from God, by one who was a supporter of many such supposed revelations; and therefore, though a Jesuit, is here a better authority on that very account, "I find that learned and very spiritually-minded men have *always disapproved of such desires and prayers;* because they usually spring from secret pride, self-esteem, and self-love, which makes such persons desire that their holiness should be made manifest to others, or at least from a vain curiosity, as St. Vincent, quoted above, has justly remarked; and therefore *God usually permits such persons to be deceived and to stumble.*"—Del Rio de Prophetia *in his* Disquis. Mag. Lugd. 1612. fol. Lib. 4. c. 1. q. 3. §. 1. p. 223.

desire for such things, and *so* enticed. (See James i. 13, 14.) The delusive appearances are not sent by God. They are the creatures of their own enthusiasm, or of the ingenuity of Satan. And that God does "withhold" the gifts for which they are seeking is the very thing for which we contend. But that he should *stop the course* of a delusion *just between* the adoption of the delusive sentiment or feeling, and the practical effect to which it naturally leads, is what no man can presume upon.

The question, then, is,—are these gifts so promised that the church is responsible for the possession of them, or, that they are the legitimate objects of the believer's desires and prayers?

Let us hear what was the opinion of Augustine on this matter. "But what," he says, "if the devil tempt you so as to say to you, If you were a Christian you would perform miracles, as many Christians have done? You are deceived by a wicked suggestion, and would tempt the Lord thy God to say to the Lord our God, If I am a Christian, and am before thine eyes, [see Ps. v. 5, and xxxi. 22,] and thou dost reckon me in the number of thy people, grant that I may do some miracle such as thy saints have often done. Thou hast tempted God, as if thou wast not a Christian, if thou couldest not do this. *Many through their desires of such things have fallen.* . . . . . What, therefore, is to be done, if he should thus tempt thee, Do miracles? What ought you to reply, that you may not tempt God? What the Lord answered, 'thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' [Matt. iv. 7.]"[4]

And so, in another place, he says, "Therefore there are

[4] "Quid si te sic tentat, ut dicat tibi, si Christianus esses faceres miracula, quomodo fecerunt multi Christiani? Tu jam suggestione mala deceptus tentares Dominum Deum tuum, ut diceres Domino Deo nostro, Si Christianus sum, et sum ante oculos tuos, et in aliquo numero tuorum me computas, faciam et ego aliquid qualia multa fecerunt sancti tui. Tentasti Deum quasi non sis Christianus si hoc non facias. Multi talia desiderantes ceciderunt, ... Ergo quid, si sic te tentet, Fac miracula? Ne tu tentes Deum, quid debes respondere? Quod respondit Dominus, &c. [Matt. iv. 7.]"—Aug. Enarr. in Ps. xc. Serm. 2. §. 7. Ed. Ben. vol. iv. col. 976.

men whom it delights to do a miracle, and who demand miracles from those who have become eminent in the church; and they who seem to themselves as if they had attained some eminence, wish to do such things, and think that they do not belong to God if they have not." [5]

And he attributes this desire of signs and miracles to a vain curiosity, "from whence," he says, "even in religion itself God is tempted, when signs and wonders are demanded, being desired, not for any purpose of salvation, but only for our own experience." [6]

And this view he confirms particularly, and several times, as it respects *the gift of tongues*. "In the primitive times," he says, "the Holy Spirit fell upon believers, and they spoke in tongues which they had not learnt, as the Spirit gave them utterance. These were signs suitable to the time. For it was right that the Holy Spirit should be thus borne witness of in all tongues, because the gospel of God was about to travel through all tongues throughout the whole world. *That testimony being given, it passed away.*" [7]

And hence he gives a frequent caution upon this subject:—thus he says,—"Let no one therefore, brethren, say, that because our Lord Jesus Christ does not do these things [*i. e.* miracles] now, therefore he prefers the former times of the Church to the present. For there is a passage in which the same Lord sets those who do not see, and yet believe, before those who believe because they see." [8]

And again; "Let no one, therefore, deceive you with

[5] "Ergo sunt homines, quos delectat miraculum facere, et ab eis qui profecerunt in Ecclesia miraculum exigunt; et ipsi qui quasi profecisse sibi videntur talia volunt facere, et putant se ad Deum non pertinere si non fecerint." Aug. Enarr. in Ps. cxxx. §. 6. Ed. Ben. vol. iv. col. 1463.

[6] "Hinc [*i. e.* curiositas] etiam in ipsa religione Deus tentatur, cum signa et prodigia flagitantur, non ad aliquam salutem sed ad solam experientiam desiderata."—Aug. Conf. lib. 10. c. 35.

[7] "Primis temporibus cadebat super credentes Spiritus Sanctus, et loquebantur linguis quas non didicerant, quomodo Spiritus dabat eis pronuntiare. Signa erant tempori opportuna. Oportebat enim ita significari in omnibus linguis Spiritum Sanctum, quia evangelium Dei per omnes linguas cursurum erat toto orbe terrarum. Significatum est illud et transiit."—August. in Ev. Johan. c. 4. Tract vi. §. 10. Ed. Ben. tom. iii. p. 2. col. 868.

[8] "Nemo itaque, fratres, dicat non facere ista [*i. e.* miracula] modo Do-

fables. Pontius performed a miracle, and Donatus prayed, and God answered him from heaven. Now, in the first place, they either are deceived themselves, or deceive others. And, in the next place, suppose that he was to remove mountains. But, says the apostle, if I have not charity, I am nothing. Let us see, then, whether he has charity. I could believe it if he had not broken the unity [of the faith]. For my God hath made me cautious even against those miracle-men, so to speak; saying, In the last days there shall rise up false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, &c. [Matt. xxiv. 24; Mark xiii. 22.] Therefore the Bridegroom has made us cautious, because we ought not to be deceived even by miracles . . . Therefore, my brethren, let us hold fast the unity of the faith: without this even he who performs miracles is nothing." [9]

Similar to this is the testimony of Chrysostom, who in one of his sermons observes, that miracles and signs were to the infant church like the supports and defences applied by the gardener to a young tree, which "Christ took away *for the future*" (λοιπον ανειλεν), when it was strong enough to stand without them; adding, "Wherefore at the beginning the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were conferred even upon the unworthy, for ancient times needed such support as a confirmation of the Christian faith, *but now they are not given even to those who are worthy to receive them*, because the power of the Christian faith is such as no longer to need this help." [1]

minum nostrum Jesum Christum et propter hoc præsentibus Ecclesiæ temporibus priora præponere. Quodam quippe loco idem Dominus videntibus et ideo credentibus præponit eos qui non vident et credunt."—Aug. Serm. 88. De Verb. Evang. Matt. xx. §. 2. Ed. Ben. tom. v. col. 470.

[9] "Nemo ergo vobis fabulas vendat. Et Pontius fecit miraculum, et Donatus oravit et respondit ei Deus de cœlo. Primo aut falluntur aut fallunt. Postremo fac illum montes transferre. Caritatem autem inquit non habeam, nihil sum. Videamus utrum habuerit caritatem. Crederem si non divisisset unitatem. Nam et contra istos, ut sic loquar, mirabiliarios cautum me fecit Deus meus, dicens, In novissimis temporibus exsurgent pseudoprophetæ, &c. [Mark xiii. 22.] Ergo cautos nos fecit sponsus, quia et miraculis decipi non debemus. . . . . Teneamus ergo unitatem, fratres mei: præter unitatem, et qui facit miracula nihil est."—Aug. In Joh. Evang. c. 3. Tract. 13. §. 17. Ed. Ben. tom. iii. p. 2. col. 398, 399.

[1] Δια τουτο παρα μεν την αρχην και αναξιοις χαρισματα εδιδοτο. χρειαν γαρ ειχε

For the *fact* of the cessation of miraculous powers in the Church at that period, we have a still stronger testimony in another part of his writings, where he says, "Of miraculous powers not even a vestige is left."[2]

It is evident, then, that in the opinion of these excellent men, two of the most able and pious of the early Christian Fathers, the Church is not responsible for the possession of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; and that in their opinion the age of miracles has so passed away that miraculous powers are *not legitimate objects of a believer's desires and prayers.* A better opportunity for discussing this point at greater length will occur hereafter,[3] but it was necessary thus to advert to it here, because it affects the very foundation upon which the present claims are built.

The reader, then, who feels the justice of the preceding remarks, can scarcely fail to recognize in them, apart from the consideration of any particular case, very powerful reasons for sifting to the utmost, and with scrupulous care, the pretensions of any who suppose themselves to be gifted with extraordinary powers. And if we add the consideration, how frequently, and with what plausibility, such claims have been advanced, without foundation, both during and since the acknowledged period of divine miracles, whatever may be our view of any particular case, we shall need nothing more to prepare us for the recurrence of them in every shape which human enthusiasm or satanic ingenuity can devise.

To reject such claims at once would indeed argue levity, undue haste, or presumption. When made by those who appear to be sincere and pious, they deserve sufficient consideration to enable us to judge of the evidences pleaded in support of them. And although in the case we are about

το παλαιον της πιστεως ἑνεκα ταυτης της βοηθειας· νυν δε ουδε αξιοις διδοται. ἡ γαρ ισχυς της πιστεως ουκετι ταυτης δειται της συμμαχιας. Serm. in inscript. Act. Apostol. Op. ed. Savil. vol. v. p. 277.

[2] Της δυναμεως εκεινης [*i. e.* των σημειων] ουδε ιχνος ὑπολελειπται—De Sacerd. lib. 4. Op. ed. Sav. vol. vi. p. 35.

[3] See the latter part of the last chapter.

to consider, many will at once fix upon certain marks as the sure characteristics of its being a work not of God, the extent to which the delusion has been allowed to prevail, shows that there are many who are not thus able at once to detect its character. In the following pages, therefore, I have endeavoured to put together those facts and considerations afforded us by Scripture, and the past history of the Church, that seem most important to enable us to form a right judgment in the matter. And may the Spirit of truth guide us in the investigation!

The circumstances connected with the rise of those claims we are about to consider, shall be stated in the words of their principal supporter, the Rev. Edward Irving, at that time the minister of the National Scotch Church, Regent Square, London.[4] "Four years ago, [*i. e.* about the beginning of the year 1828,] about the time of the opening of the National Scotch Church, when teaching to my people the orthodox and catholic doctrine of the holy sacraments, I showed from the constitution of Christian baptism, (Acts ii. 38, 39,) that the baptised church is still held by God to be responsible for the full and perfect gift of the Holy Ghost, as the same had been received by our blessed Lord upon his ascension unto glory, and by him shed down upon his church on the day of Pentecost, and by them exercised in all the ways recorded in the book of Acts, and the epistles of the holy apostles. . . . . From that time to this, and indeed since ever I read the word of God for the building up of my own faith, I have never ceased to believe that the spiritual gifts and the spiritual office-bearers, as they are enumerated in Scripture, (1 Cor. xii. 4—11; Eph. iv. 7—17. Rom. xii. 6—9. 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11, &c.) together with the various supernatural methods of operation recorded in the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, are not accidental and temporary occurrences of a miraculous kind for certain special ends and occasions, but sub-

[4] See a paper in Fraser's Magazine for the months of January, March, and April, 1832.

stantial and permanent forms of operation proper to the Holy Ghost, and in no wise to be separated from him or from the Church, which is his chosen residence and temple, the 'body of Christ' and the 'fulness of Him who filleth all in all.' With this faith firmly rooted in my heart, I did not doubt that *the only reason for the disappearance of those endowments* from the visible Church, or rather from the face of her history, was *the evil heart of unbelief*, and the hiding of 'the light of the world' under 'the bushel' of human systems and ordinances, and the 'burying of our talent in the earth' of the natural man,—a condition of things which ought not to be wondered at, seeing our Lord had expressly forewarned his church against it,—*nor did I hesitate to* PREACH THIS AS A GREAT HEAD OF CHRISTIAN FAITH, *needful to be believed for the honour of the risen Lord, for the completeness of the Spirit's work, and for the consolation and establishment of the church;* and I was never loath, on any fitting occasion, to maintain the argument with any of my clerical brethren. . . . The consequence of this distinct and explicit witness-bearing was to PREPARE A PEOPLE FOR RECEIVING THE MANIFESTATIONS when they did appear, and also to prepare my own mind for taking the decisive steps which I have taken, after I was persuaded that they were come into the midst of us. But while I was convinced so long ago of the undoubted right which the Church hath in all the manifestations of the Holy Ghost made by Christ and his apostles, and that her unfaithfulness was the only cause for their disappearance, it was not so clear to me that they would be restored again anterior to the time of his second advent. . . . If I had applied myself steadily to the resolution of this doubt, it would speedily have cleared away before the express promises of the Holy Ghost the Comforter. . . . *But the way had to be prepared by the full preaching of* CHRIST'S COMING IN OUR FLESH, *and his coming again in glory*—the two great divisions of Christian doctrine which had gone down into the earth, out of sight and out of mind, and which must be revived by preaching, *before the Holy Spirit*

could have anything to witness unto."—The doctrine here alluded to is that which Mr. Irving began about this time to promulgate more openly and prominently respecting the human nature of our Lord, viz. that our Lord "took sinful flesh or fallen human nature"— that he was "inclined to all those things which the law interdicted"—that he was "conscious of engaged with and troubled by every evil disposition which inhereth in the fallen manhood," &c. &c.; (Treat. on our Lord's Humanity;) that there was in Christ's flesh "a proclivity to the world and Satan"—and that "the law of the flesh was there all present." (Lett. to Baxter in his "Narrative," p. 107.) These sentiments were condemned as heretical by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in May, 1831; and in May, 1832, his case was referred by that assembly to the consideration of the Presbytery of Annan, by whom he had been ordained, and by whom, in March, 1833, he was for this more particularly, with other errors, deposed from his ministerial office. I proceed with his narrative:—"*Thus we stood* when the tidings of the restoration of the gift of tongues in the west of Scotland burst upon us like the morning star heralding the approach of day, and turned our speculations upon the true doctrine into the examination of a fact. . . . The particulars of the work in Scotland are as follow:—In the west of Scotland, the thick and dark veil which men have cast over the truth had been taken away, chiefly by the preaching of that faithful man of God, John Campbell, late minister of Row, *who was deposed by the last General Assembly*, for teaching [*Mr. Irving's doctrine of the work of redemption*, or as Mr. Irving chooses here most unfaithfully to represent it] that God loves every man, and that Christ died to redeem all mankind. . . . To another preacher of the Gospel, [Mr. Scott,] now also deposed by the same Assembly for postponing the Confession of Faith to the Holy Scriptures, [*i. e.* for adopting and preaching Mr. Irving's interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, instead of that contained in the Confession of Faith,] presiding at present over the Scotch congregation at Wool-

wich, it was reserved to sow the seed which hath borne this precious fruit. *He was at that time my fellow-labourer in the National Scotch Church, being our missionary to preach to the poor of this city; and as we went in and out together, he used often to signify to me his conviction that the spiritual gifts ought still to be exercised in the church; that we are at liberty and indeed* BOUND TO PRAY FOR THEM. . . . Towards the end of the year 1829, our excellent missionary,—whose mind God was more and more confirming on this head, and enabling to disentangle the subject of the baptism with the Holy Ghost from the work of regeneration, with which it is commonly confounded, whereof the latter cometh from the incarnation, and the former from the glorification, of the Son of God—being called down to Scotland upon some occasion, and residing for a while at his father's house, *which is in the heart of that district of Scotland upon which the light of Mr. Campbell's ministry had arisen,* HE WAS LED TO OPEN HIS MIND TO SOME OF THE GODLY PEOPLE IN THOSE PARTS, AND AMONG OTHERS TO A YOUNG WOMAN [Mary Campbell], WHO WAS AT THAT TIME LYING ILL OF A CONSUMPTION. . . . . BY THIS YOUNG WOMAN IT WAS THAT GOD, NOT MANY MONTHS AFTER, DID RESTORE THE GIFT OF SPEAKING WITH TONGUES AND PROPHESYING TO THE CHURCH." Mr. Scott, indeed, failed to convince her at the time, but "left her with a solemn charge . . . to beware how she rashly rejected what he believed to be the truth of God," and accordingly it was not long before the fruit of this teaching appeared. "In the month of December of the same year, 1829, the handmaid of the Lord, to whom reference hath been made above, was led by the Spirit of God to read with a new light that blessed portion of his word which is written in the 14th, 15th, and 16th chapters of the Gospel according to John, and to find therein that seed of faith and hope which afterwards bore fruit in the manifestation of the Holy Ghost. SHE SAW THERE THE TRUTH OF OUR LORD'S HUMAN NATURE. . . . SHE CAME TO SEE WHAT FOR SIX OR SEVEN YEARS I HAD BEEN PREACHING IN LONDON, that

all the works of Christ were done by the man anointed with the Holy Ghost, and not by the God mixing himself up with the man. . . . The effect of this discovery upon her, I have heard her tell, was such as to fill her soul by night and by day, for some time, to the exclusion almost of her natural rest. And these words of Peter's sermon to Cornelius were constantly in her mind:—'How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him.' (Acts x. 38.) SHE STRAIGHTWAY ARGUED, IF JESUS, AS A MAN IN MY NATURE, THUS SPAKE AND THUS PERFORMED MIGHTY WORKS BY THE HOLY GHOST, WHICH HE EVEN PROMISETH TO ME, THEN OUGHT I, IN THE SAME NATURE, BY THE SAME SPIRIT, TO DO LIKEWISE THE WORKS WHICH HE DID, AND GREATER WORKS THAN THESE. I have now before me the original letter which she wrote to a friend soon after this, bearing date the 16th of January, 1830. . . . *How surely the sound doctrines stated above had struck their roots into the heart of this young woman* is made manifest from another letter, bearing date the 23rd of March, of which the original is still preserved, and lies now before me. . . . Sometime between the 23rd of March, 1830, the date of the letter from which the last extract is made, and the end of that month, on the evening of the Lord's day, the gift of speaking with tongues was restored to the Church. 'Then he restored that which he took not away.' (Ps. lxix.) The handmaiden of the Lord, of whom he made choice on that night to manifest forth in her his glory, had been long afflicted with a disease, which the medical men pronounced to be a decline, and that it would soon bring her to her grave, whither her sister had been hurried by the same malady some months before. Yet while all around were anticipating her dissolution, she was in the strength of faith meditating missionary labours among the heathen; this night she was to receive the preparation of the Spirit,—the preparation of her body she received not till some days after.

It was on the Lord's day, and one of her sisters, along with a female friend, who had come to the house for that end, had been spending the whole day in humiliation, and fasting, and prayer before God, *with a special respect to the restoration of the gifts.* They had come up in the evening to the sick chamber of their sister, who was laid on a sofa, and, along with one or two others of the household, they were engaged in prayer together. When in the midst of their devotion, the Holy Ghost came with mighty power upon the sick woman, as she lay in her weakness, and *constrained her to speak* at great length, and with superhuman strength, *in an unknown tongue.*"[5]

Such is the account given us by Mr. Irving of the origin of those claims to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit we are about to consider.

Here, then, I would earnestly beg the reader to pause, to observe the important fact disclosed to us in this narrative, viz. that *the supposed restoration of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit to the Church took place in the person of a young woman (of a delicate and consumptive habit of body) who, some months before, had been led, through the instrumentality of Mr. Irving's assistant, to the belief that those gifts ought to be exercised by every believer, and that we are bound to desire and pray for them, and had accordingly made them the objects of her earnest and continual prayer, and who had some time previously imbibed those sentiments of Mr. Irving on our blessed Lord's human nature, which the whole Christian Church besides has pronounced awfully erroneous.* I may also add, that the supposed gifts, as to any permanent reception of them, have exclusively followed in the track of those doctrines. I commend this fact to the consideration of the reader; but notice it only by the way, as my object is to investigate the nature of the manifestations themselves, independent of any of the circumstances with which they stand connected. My reason for this is, because such claims have been frequently made, and may probably be frequently revived, unconnected with such errors.

[5] Fraser's Magazine for January, 1832.

Of the young woman above-mentioned, it is right to add, (though the fact is of little or no consequence,) that the Morning Watch itself, the organ of the party of whom we are about to treat, speaks in one place but slightingly,[6] as to judgment or solidity of mind; and certainly the memoir published of her sister, Isabella Campbell, contains sufficient proof that she partakes naturally of her sister's fervid temperament.[7]

In the summer of that year, the same supposed gift was communicated to some members of a family named M'Donald, residing at Port Glasgow, of whom the earliest account we have is one given in the Morning Watch, No. 8, p. 869, published December, 1830. "Their whole deportment," says the narrator in the Morning Watch, "gives an impression not to be conveyed in words, that their organs are made use of by supernatural power. . . . They declare that their organs of speech are made use of by the Spirit of God, and that they utter that which is given to them, and not the expressions of their own conceptions, or their own intention."

In a short time, however, the scene of miraculous agency was transferred, apparently almost exclusively, to Mr. Irving's church in London; whose hearers, as he himself would say, had long been prepared for it by his preaching.

The remarkable, and indeed unparalleled peculiarity of this gift is, that no one has yet recognized it as "a tongue," nor is it understood by the person who utters it; so that all which has been, for the last many months, communicated by it to the Church, remains as much unknown as it was before it was thus communicated. Such a gift, therefore, is so far unparalleled, since all, as far as I can find, who

[6] Morn. Watch, No. 8, p. 948.

[7] Ib. I might also add the evidence of a letter in my possession, written by her soon after the death of her sister, to a complete stranger; but as, no doubt, it was never intended for publication, I do not feel myself at liberty to make use of it. I did not however speak, without sufficient evidence, when in the former edition of this work I said that "to a weak bodily frame" she "united a mind of the most fervid and mercurial temperament," and I have now altered the sentence only to give to those who have questioned the fact *some* of the evidence on which it rests. *But it is quite immaterial, as I ground nothing upon it.*

have laid claim to the gift of tongues before, have spoken in some acknowledged language of the earth. At the very outset, then, we are called upon to take it for granted, without any evidence, that what is spoken is a real language, and that if nobody on earth will own it, it must be one used in heaven.

It was not long, however, before those who conceived themselves to have received the gift of tongues, assumed also that of prophecy; uttering their warnings, professedly under the constraining influence of a supernatural power, partly in what they called "the tongue," and partly in English.[8]

In order to show the reader that the characteristics of these so-called gifts are such as we have hereafter described them to be, some extracts are inserted here from the statements that have been laid before the public by two impartial witnesses, who were for a time themselves led away; which I have endeavoured to select so as to give a full and authentic account of the matter. The first was published by a Mr. Pilkington,[9] who, it appears, was for some time considered by Mr. Irving as being possessed of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. Whatever opinion may be

[8] It is hardly necessary to observe, that it forms but one part of the prophetic office to *predict*. Any warning delivered as from God constitutes an assumption of the office of a prophet. "Ὁ προφητης ἑρμηνευτης εστι, αλλα του Θεου," says Chrysostom; i. e. "*A prophet is an interpreter, that is of God.*" (*Chrysostom.* in 1 Cor. xiv. 28. Ed. Sav. v. 3, p. 485.) Upon which Professor Downes observes, "Recte. Propheta enim," &c. *i. e.* "Rightly." For a prophet is not so called, as is commonly thought, from a prediction of future events, but because he is an interpreter of God, and is a vicegerent of God; as we say proconsul, proprætor; προ has the force of ὑπερ, as προμαχος is ὑπερμαχος, προδικος ὑπερδικος. Virgil says, "Quæ Phœbo Pater Omnipotens mihi Phœbus Apollo." For as Helenus is the interpreter of Apollo, so Apollo himself is the interpreter of Jupiter. So the Pythian priestess is called προμαντις and προφητις. Pindar, as Eustathius quotes him, says, μαντευεο μοισα, προφατευσω δ' εγω. Theocritus, Μουσαων δε μαλιστα τιειν ἱερους ὑποφητας. Poets are prophets of the Muses. For these prepositions are interchanged, as Budæus tells us, for ὑποθεσις is sometimes written προθεσις."—Ibid. v. 8, p. 2, col. 301.

[9] The Unknown Tongues discovered to be English, Spanish, and Latin, &c. &c. By George Pilkington, 2nd Edit. 8vo.—Lond. 1831.

entertained of the judgment he displayed in the scenes of which his narrative speaks, (in which, however, it is difficult to see much inferiority to that manifested by his associates in them,) there is certainly nothing to impeach his veracity, and the tone of it is strongly characteristic of a well-meaning man. I shall give, therefore, a few extracts from it, merely as to some *matters of fact, which are abundantly confirmed by other testimonies*, and particularly by those which I shall subjoin from the other statement to which I have alluded. I would merely call the reader's attention to them, as containing a graphical delineation of some scenes which Mr. P. himself witnessed.

" During that period, I frequently heard exhortations [*i. e.* at Mr. Irving's church, at the early prayer-meetings, during nearly three months previous to Oct. 9, 1831,] from two individuals, one the brother, who continues to speak, the other a sister. . . . . The 'tongue' burst forth from the former with an astonishing and terrible crash, [which he describes, in a note, to be like as if *Cras-cran-cra-crash* were uttered with a sudden and rapid vociferation,] so suddenly, and in such short sentences, that I seldom recovered the shock before the English commenced; and as the latter always chanted, it became difficult to discriminate the Tongue from the English; nevertheless I was enabled to observe many pious and prophetic expressions. . . . . This continued, without any remarkable occurrence, till about six weeks before the Sunday alluded to, [Oct. 9, 1831,] when the brother, after speaking in Tongue, concluded, without pausing, in English:—'*O, Britain! thou anointed of the Lord, thy destruction is at hand! Fear not, ye people of God!*' These words were uttered, as usual, in an unearthly tone, which had the more imposing effect, by the posture he assumed, with his arm erect. Mr. Irving, after the solemn service which invariably succeeded these movements of the Spirit, praised God for having raised a prophet in the church, and commented on the prophecy. The sister, either on this or the following morning, prophesied that this country would be afflicted with plague

and pestilence;[1] which Mr. Irving noticed with the same deference and gratitude as he did the prophecy of the brother."

After describing several similar scenes, he proceeds:— "On Sunday the 9th of October [1831], I went to church at eleven and was as usual much gratified and comforted by Mr. Irving's lectures and prayers; but I was very unexpectedly interrupted by the well-known voice of one of the sisters, who finding she was unable to restrain herself, and respecting the regulation of the church, (for the permission given the day before, as now appeared, only extended to the prayer-meetings,) rushed into the vestry, and gave vent to utterance; whilst another (as I understood from the same impulse) ran down the side aisle, and out of the church, through the principal door. The sudden doleful and unintelligible sounds being heard by all the congregation produced the utmost confusion. . . . . Mr. Irving begged for attention, and when order was restored he explained the occurrence, which, he said, was not new, except in the congregation, where he had been for some time considering the propriety of introducing it; but though satisfied of the correctness of such a measure, he was afraid of dispersing the flock; nevertheless, as it was now brought forward by God's will, he felt it his duty to submit."

"In the evening . . . . . all went on quietly till the end of the sermon, when the brother was moved, and suddenly burst out the crash of tongue, followed by these words in English, 'God is amongst us, and if you fly from him now where will you fly in the day of judgment?'"

At a private interview in the ensuing week, Mr. Irving "said, that the gifted persons informed him that the power which *compelled* them to speak, acted on the '*end of their tongues.*'" And again, on another occasion, when Mr. Irving was asked, "if they could not restrain the tongue,

[1] A prediction which *pre*dicted nothing, for the prevalence of the cholera, more or less, in this country, was *at that time* in the natural and almost necessary course of events.

and utter the English, he said, 'No.'" To the same effect also speaks one of the "gifted" persons, as follows: —"The gifted brother now followed and accosted me. 'Pray, sir, are you the gentleman who spoke in the church on Monday?' 'Yes, sir.' 'How did you feel, sir? could you avoid it, sir?' 'I think I could have avoided it.' 'Well, since you have confessed that, allow me to advise you not to speak again unless you cannot help it.'"

From this it will be seen that the person who gives this account, had himself spoken in the church, and the fact was, as he himself informs us, that the excitement produced by the scenes he there witnessed, produced occasionally an almost irresistible impulse to give vent to his emotions by utterance, and at times he conceived himself to have the gift of interpretation.

The occasional complete unconsciousness of the speaker, as to what was uttered, is clearly proved by the following remark of one of them, after the writer of this account had given what he thought an interpretation of her words—He says, "I heard . . . . say to her neighbour, in a low voice, 'I didn't speak in English, did I?'"

At a private meeting at Mr. Irving's, where he was close to the parties who spoke, he thus describes the circumstances attending the delivery:—

"There was a solemn silence . . . . . On surveying the party, I soon perceived that the gifted sister . . . was about to speak by the violent agitation or working of her whole frame, of which it is difficult to give a written description without appearing to ridicule the parties, which is very far from being my intention . . . . . however, as I write for the information of the Christian reader, I will explain that her whole frame was in violent agitation, but principally the body, from the hips to the shoulders, which worked with a lateral motion, the chest heaved and swelled, the head was occasionally raised from the right hand, which was placed under the forehead, whilst the left hand and arm seemed to press and rub the stomach. She was but a few seconds in this state, when the body stayed, the neck

became stiff, and the head erect; the hands fell on the lap, the mouth assumed a circular form, the lips projected, and the 'tongue,' and English, came from her in an awful tone. During the utterance I observed a violent exertion of the muscles at the back of the jaw-bone, and that the stiffened lips never touched to aid the articulation of the 'tongue;' but they closed sufficiently to express the labials of the English part of the delivery, and instantly resumed the circular form."—"Gifted sister . . . now spoke, but uttered nothing in tongue, except half a dozen musical tones. (Solemn silence.) Gifted sister . . . . spoke entirely in English. (Silence.) The gifted brother spoke in tongue and English."

He proceeds to detail the particulars of various other similar scenes, both in the public services and the private prayer-meetings, at Mr. Irving's church.

The confirmation of these particulars may be found in statements from persons present, inserted in most of the periodical papers of the time, especially the Record newspaper. Similar statements, also, may be found interspersed in them up to the present time. One relating to Mrs. Caird (the late Miss Campbell) may be found in the Record for December 20, 1832, giving an account of her speaking "in tongue," in the middle of her husband's sermon at his chapel at Brighton, a few days previous.

The other publication to which I have referred, is a valuable "Narrative of Facts"[2] published about a year ago by a gentleman, who for some time was one of the principal speakers of the party, but now considers himself to have been, with his associates, under a delusion. The following extracts are well worth the reader's attention. The education and piety of the writer entitle his

[2] Narrative of Facts, characterizing the supernatural manifestations in members of Mr. Irving's congregation and other individuals, in England and Scotland, and formerly in the writer himself. By Robert Baxter. Lond. 1833, 12mo. 2nd edition, with Preface on the Spiritual Influence permitted to Satan, and Remarks on Mr. Irving's and the Morning Watch's reviews of the Narrative. Lond. 1833. 12mo.

testimony to our implicit confidence and respect, as to the facts of the case.

"In the midst of the feeling of awe and reverence which this [his first witnessing "the power" in another] produced, I was myself seized upon by the power; and in much struggling against it was made to cry out, and myself to give forth a confession of my own sin in the matter for which we were rebuked, and afterwards to utter a prophecy that the messengers of the Lord should go forth publishing to the ends of the earth, in the mighty power of God, the testimony of the near coming of the Lord Jesus."[5]

"I was conscious of a constrained utterance not my own."[6]

"I was under such a painful constraint, that every word I uttered was, as it were, wrung from me."[7]

"I cannot for a moment [he says, in a letter to his brother written while under the delusion] doubt the reality of the manifestations; and the Spirit secretly bears witness with my own spirit that he has spoken in me, and leads me to the expectation that he may yet again constrain my utterance."[8]

"By a constraint I cannot describe I was made to speak."[9]

"This prayer . . . was forced from me by the constraint of the power which acted upon me; and the utterance was so loud, that I put my handkerchief to my mouth to stop the sound, that I might not alarm the house."[1]

"When teaching at a Sunday School, the power came upon me in the way of constraint: constraining me to leave and return to my study."[2]

"The power fell upon me, and I was made to speak; and for two hours or upwards, with very little interval, the power continued upon me, and I gave forth what we all regarded as prophecies concerning the church and the na-

[5] R. Baxter's Narrative of Facts, p. 5.
[6] Ib. p. 148. [7] Ib. [8] Ib. p. 149. [9] Ib. p. 8.
[1] Ib. p. 9. [2] Ib. p. 10.

tion—declaring God's anger rested upon the nation because of its wickedness and infidelity . . . that the visitation of Pharaoh would come upon the land, and it would be as a charnel-house for the multitude of the slain. On the church the denouncements against the unfaithful pastors were most fearful—that it was flowing on into the power of the enemy, and falling from its office of God's witness in the earth. These prophecies were mingled with others most glorious and gracious, as they appeared to us—declaring the Spirit should be abundantly poured forth . . . that the Lord was at hand—the morning star arising among us, and the signs of his coming all around us. The power which then rested on me was far more mighty than before, laying down my mind and body in perfect obedience."[3]

"All was the work of the moment, AND I WAS AS THE PASSIVE INSTRUMENT OF THE POWER WHICH USED ME."[4]

"To several questions which were asked, answers were given by me in the power. One in particular was so answered, with such reference to the circumstances of the case of which in myself I was wholly ignorant, as to convince the person who asked it that *the spirit speaking in me* knew those circumstances, and alluded to them in the answer."[5]

"The interpretation was wholly unthought of by me before I was made to speak it, and the light on the mind and conviction was not given me, but I was made to speak the words, and was left to gather and connect the meaning, and confirm myself in the truth of it."[6]

"On another occasion, unknown to each other, we [himself and his wife] each received at the same time a revelation concerning some of our kindred, which shewed us the work of a spirit upon us."[7]

"I found on a sudden, in the midst of my accustomed course, a power coming upon me which was altogether new—an unnatural, and in many cases a most appalling utterance given to me—matters noticed by me in this power of which I had never thought, *and many of which I did not*

[3] Ib. p. 13. [4] Ib. p. 14. [5] Ib. p. 14. [6] Ib. p. 15.
[7] Ib. p. 18.

understand until long after they were uttered—an enlarged comprehension and clearness of view given to me on points which were really the truth of God, (though mingled with many things which I have since seen not to be truth, but which then had the form of truth)—great setting out of Christ—great joy and freedom in prayer—and seemingly great nearness of communion with God in the midst of the workings of the power—the course of the power quite contrary to the course of excitement. It was manifest to me the power was supernatural; it was therefore a spirit. It seemed to me to bear testimony to Christ, and to work the fruits of the Spirit of God. The conclusion was inevitable, that it was the Spirit of God; and, if so, the deduction was immediate, that it ought in all things to be obeyed. If I UNDERSTOOD NOT THE WORDS I WAS MADE TO UTTER, it was consistent with the idea of the utterances of the Spirit, that deep and mysterious things should be spoken. If I were commanded to do a thing of which I saw not the use, was I to dare to pause upon God's command? If, indeed, the thing were clearly contrary to God's truth, it would have been clear God had not spoken it; but if it was a thing indifferent, surely (I reasoned) God is to be obeyed. If any one is once persuaded that the Spirit of God speaks in him by any particular mode of communication, it will henceforth be his study only to discern that he does not mistake his own feelings and impulses for that communication. Looking back upon it now, I can only say, all this demonstration of truth and holiness would not have been permitted to deceive us, if we had not forgotten the text, 'as an angel of light.'"[8]

"When I had read this, and was thinking upon it, the power came upon me, and I was made to say, 'The word of the Lord is as fire; and if ye, O vessel who speak, refuse to speak the word, ye shall utterly perish, &c.'"[9]

"A prophecy was given to me . . . . that the Spirit was not taken from faithful men in the church, but from the visible church as a body. That the whole visible church

[8] Ib. pp. 22, 23. [9] Ib p. 27.

was now cast off as God's church, and God would bring forth his spiritual church with the fulness of the gifts of the Spirit . . . . The condemnation proceeded upon the fact of the quenching of the Spirit in the midst of our church." [1]

"At the end of the three years and a half from the beginning of the prophecy of the witnesses . . . Satan should take to himself the sovereignty, and stand forth in all hideous power in the person of one man, to receive the worship of all the earth;—that this, in particular and in fulness, was '*the man of sin whom*,' &c. . . . . The person who should be so energized of Satan, and be set up as his Christ, was at a subsequent period declared to be young Napoleon." [2]

"Concerning the Bible Society, a distinct burden of prophecy was given;—*that it was the curse going through the land, quenching the Spirit of God by the letter of the word of God.*" [3]

"As I was about to enter the church the power filled me . . . . . the utterance broke forth from me in a severe rebuke . . . . . This was followed by a short recapitulation of matters which had been on former occasions uttered concerning God's casting off the visible church . . . . . God's purpose of endowing and sending forth through the land, and to the ends of the earth, ministers speaking in power as I was speaking; and of filling them with all power in mighty signs and wonders, to bear his last warning to the world, and to prepare a people, before the great and terrible day of the Lord. I was then made to give forth a distinct command to all present, and to all who should hear it, to go forth and declare wherever the providence of God should open a place of testimony to them, the *near coming of Christ*, and the coming in of the *spiritual* ministry." [4]

"I was made to declare, I should minister in his church on Sunday, and then should be begun the *spiritual* ministrations, which would never cease until the Lord should come. . . . . The power came upon me in an exhortation to the people . . . . that the Lord was at hand; and as a witness

[1] Ib. pp. 28, 29. [2] Ib. p. 31. [3] Ib. p. 33. [4] Ib. p. 37.

to his people, God was now sending forth a ministry, not ministering in the flesh but in the spirit, who should teach and minister in the utterance of the Spirit, and in due time be endowed with all the mighty power of the Spirit . . . . . The power came down again upon me, and I read in great power the 61st chapter of Isaiah, and preached in the power for upwards of an hour . . . . . Fearful denunciations of judgment were given both morning and evening, and the reiterated declaration that within three years and a half the believers in the Lord would be caught up to him, and the world delivered over to the judgments of God. Much as was the false prophecy which was mixed up with these testimonies, and fearful as was the assumption of speaking by the utterance of the Spirit, I have been much confounded by the fact occurring in this instance, as also in most others of the public testimonies in preaching; that Christ was preached in such power and with such clearness, and the exhortations to repentance so energetic and arousing, that it is hard to believe the person delivering it could be under the delusion of Satan. Yet so it was."[5]

"The power was present to . . . . bear me up with the thought; 'yet three years and a half, and we shall be joined in the glory of the Lord.'"[6]

"Concerning this individual, it was shown to me more than once in the form of revelation, and twice was it declared in utterance that he should be brought to acknowledge the work, and be himself a minister in it. This, however, has never come to pass."[7]

"The interpretation so given [i. e. by "the power"] was, that the 'woman in heaven' was the spiritual church as contradistinguished from the visible church—the symbol of the visible church being found in the next chapter as the 'beast rising out of the earth.' By the spiritual church was meant the members of the church who were partakers of the Spirit of God [of course in *their* sense of the phrase]."[8]

"In the utterance at this time there was a further open-

[5] Ib. pp. 41—44. [6] Ib. p. 46. [7] Ib. p. 48. [8] Ib. p. 56.

ing of these four trumpets . . . . reiterating . . . . . that the Reform Bill would not pass, that the people thought they had it, but it should not pass . . . . that the great captain of Waterloo would again be made prime minister; and that it was he who should take to pieces the constitution, and be the instrument of fulfilling the third and fourth trumpets."[9]

" I attended a monthly meeting . . . . . for reading and expounding the Scriptures . . . . . The part of Scripture which was at that time appointed for consideration was from Ephesians: ' We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but,' &c. . . . . When in my turn I spoke upon the text, I was more particularly led to set out the craftiness and deceivableness [deceitfulness] of Satan as an angel of light; and as I proceeded, the power came upon me, carrying forward the exposition, and showing how Satan, taking to himself the guise of the Spirit, worked among all professors, and even amongst God's own people; not simply through the world and the flesh introducing himself, but more particularly in the form of suggestions through the senses, and by spiritual workings upon the mind, raised imaginations, fostered pride, and wrung from us worship and service to himself, whilst we persuaded ourselves we were following the teaching of the Spirit . . . . At this time . . . the display of this truth was used to rivet me and those with me in the power of the enemy. After this scripture had been opened, the power in me passed on to a prophecy upon the state of the church—setting out that she was ensnared by the enemy—declaring and *denouncing the judgments of God which were coming upon her* and all the earth; and most fearfully warning all ministers to stand up in their places and teach these things; and declare also what had been revealed by the prophets to the church, that *within three years and a half* the saints would be caught up to the Lord and the earth wholly given up to the days of vengeance . . . The power then passed into a prophecy of the development of the mystical man of sin, and of the

[9] Ib. p. 61.

personal man of sin in the person of young Napoleon . . . . The friend at whose house we were assembled, had called in his servants; and when I ceased, and we were about to separate, he began to say a few words to explain to them what had been prophesied, when the power fell upon him, and he was carried out manifestly beyond himself; and (as he describes his own feelings) without any expectation of it; and, when the power came upon him, without knowing what he had to say or do, but *giving utterance as he was constrained.* The purport of his utterance was confirming what had been said upon the rapture of the saints within three years and a half."[1]

"Subsequently to this came utterances preparing us for some great favour and grace, which it was said the Lord had ordained for us, bidding us enlarge our hearts, lest through the abundance of God's grace and favour we should stumble in unbelief, as though the promise was too great for us—adding a striking expostulation with the church for hardness of heart and slowness to believe all that the prophets had spoken—and concluding that we were all straitened in our own bowels, whilst the Lord's love was unbounded, and the Lord was hindered by the want of faith, in his love, from doing far greater things for his church and people than had yet been seen. . . . . At the interval of a day or two there followed an appalling utterance—that the Lord had set me apart for himself—that from the day I was called to the spiritual ministry I must count forty days—that this was now well nigh expired—that for those forty days was it appointed I should be tried—that the Lord had tried me and found me faithful; and having now proved in me the first sign of an apostle, 'patience,' (referring to 2 Cor. xii. 12,) he would give to me the fulness of them in the gifts of 'signs and wonders and mighty deeds',—that the Lord had called me to be an apostle, and by the laying [on] of my hands, and the hands of the other apostles whom the Lord should call, should the baptism of fire be bestowed . . . . On the fortieth day

[1] Ib. pp. 62, 63.

power should be given, the sick should be healed, the deaf should hear, the dead should be restored. . . . . This full development took place on the Friday preceding the fortieth day, which would fall on a Wednesday. . . . . On the Monday I went to town, and reaching it on the Tuesday morning, I joined the early prayer-meeting. In my way to town I passed by the clergyman . . . . who . . . spoke in the power at his own house . . . . He told me he had had a revelation . . . . The power came greatly on me, and *I spoke two words in an unknown tongue, the meaning of which was not given me.* . . . . I joined the prayer-meeting in London. . . . . Mr. Irving called on me to read and pray with them. Whilst I was talking to him the power came on me, and I was made to give him and the congregation assembled a most severe rebuke, and then indistinctly to allude to that which had been prophesied concerning the immediate gift of signs and wonders. . . . . On the morrow, at the morning prayer-meeting, nothing peculiar occurred. At breakfast several strangers to me were present, and having been made to give forth what seemed a most glorious prophecy concerning the endowments which would attend upon the spiritual apostles whom the Lord would now send forth, *in how much they would exceed the endowments given to the twelve apostles*, it was distinctly shown me in the power, before any one had spoken, that some one person in the room had a mind which utterly repudiated what was so prophesied. . . . . A voice at the top of the room struck me, and it was shown me he was the man. I said so to him, and requested him to speak. He did speak out, and showed very strikingly how exactly his state of mind had been opened to me . . . I had never seen the man, nor to my knowledge heard the sound of his voice, before I told out the state of his mind; and as soon as I heard the sound of his voice, I recognized him as the person referred to. It operated as a confirmatory sign to those who believed in the work, and I can only explain it upon the text before quoted, (Deut. xiii.), as a sign permitted of the Lord to prove us. *The day, how-*

ever, passed over without any manifestation of the power which had been foretold."[2]

"The next day . . . . I attended the services, and was made to speak much in power in the midst of the congregation, declaring . . . . that the utter desolation of the land was decreed by the Lord, and judgment only now lingered; and then I was made to pronounce 'the decree, Thus saith the Lord, *within three years and a half this land shall be desolate.*' . . . . The effect produced upon the congregation seemed to be very great. . . . . Mr. Irving . . embraced me as I joined him in the vestry, and before his elders and a part of his congregation, broke out into a thanksgiving to God for having sent such light into the midst of them. He seemed from this time without a doubt that the work which had been foretold would immediately proceed, and began to preach and teach from his pulpit the interpretation of the trumpets and the doctrine of the baptism by fire, and forthcoming apostolic mission."[3]

"From the time of my first public exercise of the power, it will be observed from what has been before detailed, how strongly the distinction was taken between my ministrations and the ministrations of commonly ordained ministers--*mine being called the spiritual ministry, theirs the fleshly ministry. The same distinction was carried through the church also—the church receiving the ministry of the prophets speaking by the utterance of the Spirit was called the spiritual church, in contradistinction to the visible church.*"[4]

"In subsequent utterances it became confirmed that the spiritual church could not be fully constituted until the full powers of an apostle were given, and of this we were now in daily, and, I may say, hourly expectation, as the day for which they were promised was passed, and we could find no satisfactory explanation of the delay."[5]

"It was distinctly revealed in the power, and I was made to utter, that the American Indians were the lost ten tribes, and that they should within the three years and a

[2] Ib. pp. 65—70. [3] Ib. pp. 70, 71. [4] Ib. p. 77. [5] Ib. p. 79.

half appointed for the spiritual ministry be gathered back into their own land, and be settled there before the days of vengeance set in—that the chief, who was now in London, was a chosen vessel of the Lord to lead them back—that he should be endowed with power from on high in all signs and mighty wonders, and should lead them back, though in unbelief—that he would receive his power here, and be speedily sent forth to them . . . . On another evening . . I was made in a most triumphant chant to address him as the vessel chosen of God, and to be endowed of God for the bringing back of his brethren. . . . . The chief went away to his countrymen, an unbeliever in the work, and none of the powers have been at all manifested."[6]

"They [i. e. Mr. Irving and his followers] are now avowedly exercising apostolic functions upon the mere command of the voice, without pretending to have the signs of an apostle 'in signs and wonders and mighty deeds;' and the individual who has been thus set apart for the apostolic office prays in their meetings in the following strain:—'Lord, am I not thine apostle? yet where are the signs of my apostleship? where are the wonders and mighty deeds? O Lord, send them down upon us,' &c. He has, as an apostle, and in the name of an apostle, laid hands on several, and ordained them to the ministerial office as evangelists and elders; yet it is not pretended that the manifestation of the baptism of the Holy Ghost follows with the laying on of his hands."[7]

"A clergyman who . . . had come expressly to inquire . . . was present . . . . professed his faith in the work, and I was made to tell him he was doubting, and was not confirmed in it. And I have since heard that he was in so much doubt, that when he came to consider he abandoned the work as delusion. *Whilst under the awe of the presence of the supernatural power, he was so confounded or overcome, as to profess full faith in it, and believe himself to be really receiving it.*"[8]

"I returned into the country . . . On the fourth day

[6] Ib. pp. 80—82. [7] Ib. pp. 84, 85. [8] Ib. pp. 86—88.

after my return . . . a power came upon her [his wife] in the form of revelation . . . . giving to her a reason why the powers, and signs, and wonders, were not bestowed upon the fortieth day, and assuring her of great blessings from the Lord, and a speedy fulfilment of what had been prophesied. It was also told her as a sign to prove this revelation to be of God, that as soon as I came home, when she came to me, I should say, 'Speak, speak;' and then, after she had told me the revelation, I should speak to her in the power, and beginning, 'It is of the Lord,' should fully explain what had been revealed to her. When I came home, I thought she seemed much troubled, and, unconscious of what had occurred, I said, 'Speak, speak.' Upon this she told me the revelation, not saying any thing about my speaking afterwards, and when she had told me, the power immediately came upon me to utterance, and I was made to say, in great power, 'It is of the Lord,' and then to open and explain it."[9]

"In the utterance which followed, it was declared that the power was not given on the fortieth day, because the church in London had failed in love towards the visible church which God had cast off . . . . . Then followed in the power a most emphatic declaration, that on the day after the morrow we should both be baptized with fire—so should we be joined together in the bond of the Lord's baptism—the Lord also joining himself to his desolate church again, by bringing forth visibly a spiritual church, with spiritual ordinances in fulness of power and gifts—that had the church in London manifested greater love, this baptism and power would have been given there, but now it should be given here, and on the day named we should receive it, and thenceforward would the work proceed in swiftness and not again tarry . . . . . The day named arrived, and in the evening an utterance from the power, 'Kneel down, and receive the baptism by fire.' We knelt down, lifting up prayer to God continually. Nothing however ensued. Again and again we knelt, and again and

[9] Ib. pp. 88, 89.

again we prayed, but still no fulfilment. . . . For six weeks . . . . I continued unshaken to seek after it, but found it not. The baptism by fire was fully explained in utterance, to be the burning out of the carnal mind and subduing every sinful lust of the flesh . . . . that the fulness of the presence of the Holy Ghost should accompany it . . . . that the gifts of the Spirit would also follow . . . . that it was a baptism specially reserved for the three years and a half of the last ministry upon earth."[1]

"From the time of my return from town the difficulties and perplexities seemed, on all sides, to increase. A few days after I left him, Mr. Irving forwarding me a letter, added a few lines of his own . . . . stating how they looked forward to my return with the full powers of an apostle; but at the same time adding that Mr. F., who had spoken in power amongst us, had been found to speak by an evil spirit, Mrs. C. and Miss E. C. having been made so to declare. This troubled me greatly, for I had been made in power to declare to him his call to the spiritual ministry . . . . . After a short interval came a letter from Mr. Irving, which yet more perplexed me. He said, 'This moment the Lord hath sent me a very wonderful and wonderfully gracious message by our dear sister, Miss E. C., concerning the time which you have been made so often to put forth. Rebuking me for having repeated it . . . . declaring the word to be a true word, but containing a mystery, declaring that the day is not known.' . . . . . I was amazed at this message, for constantly had I been made in power to declare the time, and to explain it and enforce it; and more than once I had been made to enjoin ministers publicly to preach it *in the flesh, though they had no gift*. . . . . A little later came another blow—intelligence was sent me that Miss H., who had for months been received as a prophetess among them,—(who had been the first to speak in the Sunday congregation, and whose speaking Miss E. C. on that occasion was made in power to declare, ought to be heard: to whom, also, I in power had spoken as a prophetess; and on a second

[1] Ib. pp. 89—91.

occasion, Miss E. C. had alluded, as speaking of the Lord,) —that she had by Miss E. C. and Mrs. C. been charged with feigning utterances, and they in power had pronounced that the whole work in her was of the flesh and not of the Lord. I had heard her speak, and her utterance seemed to me at times as full and as clearly supernatural as Miss E. C.'s.—She had also begun a prophecy which Miss E. C. would take up and complete, and she would take up in power what Miss E. C. had begun, so as to cause Mr. Irving to remark how manifestly one spirit spoke in both. . . . Added to all this, the fast-day passed over, and notwithstanding all the prophecies marking it out as a day much to be remembered, and the day of the Lord's answer by fire, nothing had occurred upon it . . . . Upon my return from town I saw again the friend whose attempt to perform a miracle had failed . . . . I was made, on several occasions, to speak in power to him, and declare that the message to perform the miracle was of the Lord, and . . . that it should yet be fulfilled. . . . The person on whom the miracle was to be performed is dead, never having been in the least degree restored. Distressing as all these occurrences were, yet I dared not, on account of them, suffer myself to deny the work. The supernatural nature of it was so clear—the testimony to Jesus so full—the outpouring of prayer, and, as it seemed to me, the leading towards communion with God so constant in it, that I still could not condemn it, but treated every doubt as a temptation. I rested implicitly upon the text, 'Every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God,' and felt assured that no spirit making that confession could be of Satan."[2]

"Whilst upon this point it is necessary I should refer to a remarkable occurrence in Gloucestershire, which served to sustain my faith in the verbal confession, as an unfailing trial of the spirit. In the latter end of the past year, [1831,] two children of a pious and exemplary clergyman there, had been made to speak by a supernatural power. They were twins, a boy and a girl, and only eight or nine

[2] Ib. pp. 91—96.

years of age, children in whom nothing of a religious turn had been remarked. Their parents were unfortunately led to seek after the manifestations, believing them to be of the Spirit of God. From the time the mouths of the children were opened, their conduct seemed so much changed, that they appeared most religious and devoted children. Their utterance was most astounding; beginning in the setting forth of Jesus, and calling to self-abasement before his cross; and preaching with such recital of Scripture and such power of argument and exhortation, as might be said to surpass many able ministers, and certainly quite out of the compass of children of their age and understanding. Having by this demonstration of power, of truth, and holiness, gained the confidence of their parents, and friends, they were carried on to deliver prophecies of things which were coming to pass—then uttering commands to their parents and friends, and sending them here and there— denouncing the judgments of God upon the church and world, and setting a day for a particular manifestation of judgment.—Shortly things were spoken by them which seemed to their parents contrary to Scripture, and they were startled by an utterance forbidding to marry. This was so plainly the work of a false spirit, that their parents and friends were greatly distressed, and though much awed by the influence which the power had obtained over them, they remembered they had forgotten the command, 'try the spirits,' and they wished to try the spirit in the children by the Scripture test. They accordingly called the boy and told him their doubts, and that they must try the spirit. The boy seemed to be much wrought upon by the power, and in the supernatural utterance said, 'Ye may try the spirits in men, but ye may not try the spirits in children. Ye will surely be punished.' They however persisted; though the father was so much agitated as not to be able to do it; yet the curate addressed the spirit in the child, and demanded, in the words of Scripture, a confession that Christ was come in the flesh. Paleness and agitation increased over the child, till an utterance broke

from him, 'I will never confess it.' They were thus satisfied it was an evil power which spoke in him, and the curate went on to say, 'I command thee, thou false spirit, in the name of Jesus, to come out of the child.' As the child afterwards described his feelings, he felt as though a coldness was removed from his heart and passed away from him. . . . . This narrative, which I first saw in print, has been confirmed to me by one who was an eye and ear witness of the whole. . . . . In these children, at least, neither excitement nor imagination can account for it."[3]

He observes in a subsequent part of his work, that "when Mr. Irving heard of the occurrence in Gloucestershire, he thought it right to call together the gifted persons to try the spirit," and that they all uttered a confession, which Mr. Irving considered "tantamount to a confession of Christ come in the flesh;" but among other exceptions to this testimony, particularly Mr. Irving's "own erroneous views concerning Christ's flesh," he justly observes that "a mere verbal confession is not all that is required," and also, "as fully proving the inadequacy of Mr. Irving's test of the spirit, even to himself, it is a fact that Miss H., who is now declared by the other gifted persons to have been a false prophetess, was one of those who, in this trial, joined in the confession."[4]

"Continuing, however, in the exercise of this power," he was at last "led to an examination of doctrines."[5] His persuasion had been, "that Mr. Irving did not hold the law of sin to be in Jesus,"[6] but, from some communications made to him, being "led to search more fully into the views he held," he "not only found on the further reading of his work that his views were unsound on the human nature of our Lord, but that he was also still more unsound on the doctrines concerning holiness—he rejecting the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and holding a perfect holiness in the flesh."[7]

"I sat down," he says, "to write to Mr. Irving, stating

[3] Ib. pp. 97, 98. [4] Ib. pp. 131—133. [5] Ib. pp. 98, 99.
[6] Ib. p. 100. [7] Ib. pp. 101, 102.

fully his error in conceiving the law of sin to be in the flesh of Jesus, and stating, also, what I conceived to be the truth concerning our holiness. . . . . As Mr. Irving regarded me destined to the apostolic office and set for the instruction of his church, I had great confidence that he would receive this."[8] Mr. Irving, in his reply, warmly supports his own views, and tells him, "the spirit came upon Miss E. C., and after speaking in a very grieved tone and spirit in a tongue, she was made to declare. . . .that you had been snared by departing from the word and the testimony—that I had maintained the truth, and the Lord was well pleased with me for it," which was followed by a similar utterance from Mrs. C. and a renewed utterance to the same effect from Miss E. C.[9] "This letter," he adds, "was at once a great blow to me. Here I saw doctrines which I could never have believed Mr. Irving held, not only avowed by him, but sustained and enforced by the utterance in power of those who were deemed the gifted persons."[1] "These considerations of doctrine weighed with me, and I could not for a moment doubt the erroneousness of Mr. Irving's views. *I was then of necessity compelled to conclude the utterances which supported those views, were not of the Spirit of God.* Upon this a doubt arose in my own mind, which, however, I trembled to entertain, and yet, with such facts before me, I could not reject: whether the whole work were not of Satan. I could not conceive of a person speaking at one moment by the Spirit of God, and the next by the spirit of Satan; moreover it had been declared in the power by the mouth of Mrs. C., Miss E. C., and my own mouth, that God would guard the utterance of his prophets, and they should never be permitted to speak by the power of Satan. According, therefore, to my view and understanding of Scripture, a false utterance convicted a person of being a false prophet; and this was also according to the interpretation of the power I had been acting under. Mrs. C., Miss E. C., and Mr. T. were therefore on both grounds manifestly to be deemed

[8] Ib. p. 102. [9] Ib. pp. 103–5. [1] Ib. p. 108.

false prophets, and this, as to the two former, upon a test of scripture doctrine. Then, was not I convicted as a false prophet by the nonfulfilment of the words I had spoken, according to the test in the book of Deuteronomy? *And might not the whole be accounted for as a chastisement of God sent for the correction of heresy?* . . . Being anxious to communicate with Mr. Irving I travelled on to London. . . . Calling him and Mr. J. C. apart, I told them my conviction that we had all been speaking by a lying spirit, and not by the Spirit of the Lord. He said it was impossible God could have sent us strong delusions, for that was his final judgment upon the wicked, and we at least thought ourselves seeking after the Lord, and desiring his glory. I answered, I believed God had sent it as a chastisement for *pride and lofty imaginations*. . . . I saw him again in the evening, and on the succeeding morning I endeavoured to convince him of his error of doctrine, and of our delusions concerning the work of the Spirit, but he was so shut up he could not see either. I particularly pressed upon Miss E. C. and Mrs. C., and upon him also, the non-fulfilment of the word, and particularly the falseness of that prophecy which they, as well as myself, had given, that God would guard the utterance of his prophets, and not suffer Satan to speak by them; whereas, in the case of Mr. T., alluded to in Mr. Irving's letter, he, who was, and I believe is still, received as a prophet, had in the midst of the congregation, with tongues, and in English, spoken evil of Mr. Irving, and Miss E. C. had since in utterance declared he spoke it of Satan . . . . . The argument upon which Mr. Irving mainly relied for parrying the difficulties was this; that *the same person might at one moment speak by the Spirit of God, and the next moment by an evil spirit.* He urged, therefore, that those things which had failed were from the false spirit, and those which were fulfilled were of God."[2]

"After my first visit I found the utterance amongst them warned them against having intercourse with me; and

[2] Ib. pp. 116—119.

they now shut themselves up, refusing to hear arguments, or discuss the subject at all." [3]

"There are some general characteristics in the work which, apart from doctrines or instances of failure of predictions, cast suspicion upon it. One is the extreme *secresy* enjoined by the Spirit, and the manifest shrinking from public examination. . . . . Another is, *the manifest denouncement and debasement of the understanding* . . . . . It is manifest, the grace of God, and the teaching of the Spirit of God, purifies and enlarges the understanding, and gives us to discover by the understanding between truth and error. The understanding, therefore, humbled before the Word and the Spirit of the Lord, is yet used and strengthened by the same Word and Spirit, and the man of God walks according to an enlightened understanding, in the degree of light which God vouchsafes to give him. Now I am assured, both from the remembrance of my own utterances in power, and from those of others, as well as from the later correspondence with the gifted persons, that *the Spirit manifested in us all, has always striven to put aside the understanding, and bring its followers into an absolute submission to the utterances* . . . . . Another characteristic is, *the bitterness of denunciation and hastiness of spirit* found in the manifestations of the power. . . . . The last characteristic to which I would allude, is, *the spirit of separation which marks out a line by the reception or rejection of the utterances*—all who bow to the utterances are received; those who cannot are not acknowledged, but after the first and second admonition are rejected. The effect of this is very extraordinary: it casts off, under the name of Babylon, the great mass even of orthodox professors, and raises up *the little church which does receive the utterances, into the distinctive title of 'The Church.'*" [4]

"Whilst, however, I am constrained to declare these convictions concerning the spirit . . . . I must speak very differently both of Mr. Irving himself, and also of those of

[3] Ib. p. 124. [4] Ib. pp. 126—128.

his congregation who speak in the power, and others whom I have met there . . . . I believe him to be a man of God sincerely searching after truth, though *for the casting down of high thoughts*, and for vindicating his own truth, God has suffered him to be led away of delusion . . . He is confident in his own honesty of intention in all that he has done, not being yet sufficiently versed in the deceitfulness of the heart and the subtlety of that pride which clothes itself in the garb of holy zeal, and plumes its own crest under the name of contending for the truth of God. His mind is so imaginative as almost to scorn precision of ideas. . . . Yet with all this, there is much real candour, real devotedness, real love to God, and charity towards all men . . . Of those who speak, and of others of his flock whom I have known, I may say, apart from the influence of delusion, there is, as with himself, a Christian spirit and a sincere love of the truth. The delusion produces a bitterness of spirit and violence very manifest. But they are deceived, and not deceivers save instrumentally . . . . . they are really acted upon by a supernatural power, and they really believe and worship it as the Holy Spirit of Jehovah." [5]

"As considerable stress has occasionally been laid upon this form of utterance, [i. e. "in other languages,"] in support of the work, I will here allude to it. A few days before the prophecy of my call to the apostolic office, whilst sitting at home, a mighty power came upon me, but for a considerable time no impulse to utterance; presently a sentence in French was vividly set before my mind, and, under an impulse to utterance, was spoken. Then in a little time sentences in Latin were in like manner uttered, and with short intervals sentences in many other languages, judging from the sound and the different exercise of the enunciating organs. My wife, who was with me, declared some of them to be Italian and Spanish; the first she can read and translate, the second she knows but little of. In this case, she was *not able to interpret nor retain the words as they were uttered.* All the time of these utterances I was greatly

[5] Ib. pp. 129, 130.

tried in mind. After the first sentence, an impulse to utterance continued on me; and most painfully I restrained it, my conviction being, that until something was set before me to utter, I ought not to yield my tongue to utterance. . . . . Immediately following this exercise, there came an utterance in English, declaring that the gift of tongues, which was manifest in London, was nothing more than that of 'the tongue,' needing interpretation manifested formerly in the Corinthian church, but that shortly the Lord would bestow the *Pentecostal gift, enabling those who received it to preach in all languages to the nations of the earth.* . . . . . When I went to London after this, I questioned those who spoke in the tongues, whether they had the words and sentences given, or yielded their tongues to the impulse of utterance without having them. *They answered almost entirely the latter, though sometimes also the former* . . . My persuasion concerning the unknown tongue, as it is called, (in which I myself was very little exercised,) is, that it is no language whatever, but a mere collection of words and sentences; and in the lengthened discourses is, much of it, *a jargon of sounds;* though I can conceive, when the power is very great, that it will assume much of the form of a connected oration."[6]

"The instances of . . . . obvious discernment of thoughts are so numerous as to take away the possibility of their being accidental coincidences. In the case of one individual, when praying in silence in her own room, in three or four distinct instances, answers were given in the power by a gifted person sitting in the adjoining room; and in almost all the persons with whom I have conversed, who were brought into a belief of the power, instances of obvious discernment of their thoughts, or references to their particular state of mind, have been so striking as to conduce to their recognition of the power."[7]

"The whole work is a mimicry of the gifts of the Spirit —the utterance in tongues a mimicry of the gift of tongues—and so of the prophesyings and all the other

[6] Ib. pp. 133—135.

[7] Ib. p. 135.

works of the power. It is Satan as an angel of light, imitating, as far as permitted, the Holy Spirit of God."[8]

"*It has been most fully manifested that a false spirit does bear witness against Satan.* The warnings against Satan, given by the children in Gloucestershire, were very abundant, and the same occurred in Mr. F., Miss H., and almost without exception all the others who have spoken in power in the Scotch church, and have been rejected as false prophets."[9]

"I understand the gifted persons at Port Glasgow spoke against me, whilst I was speaking in power in London; and that they are now speaking against Mr. Irving. At Cambridge too, I understand, is one who deems himself called to be an apostle, and to have arrived at perfection; and who sent for a friend some hundred miles off to impart to him the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of his hands; but when he came, and the hands were imposed, the gift did not follow. He also is denounced by Miss E. C., and himself holds Mr. Irving and the gifted in London, to be deceived. These discrepancies and disagreements are so many landmarks which he who runs may read."[1]

"In conclusion, I cannot refrain from adding a remark or two upon the causes which have, as it appears to me, prepared the way for this awful delusion . . . . In the front I would place a habit of speculating upon religious truths, in the hasty interpretation of Scripture, and especially the prophetic portions. . . . Another course of speculation has been upon doctrines and generally received truths, in an opening of them *after a new method,* or in the giving *a greater prominency* to particular parts. . . . . Whether the departure in doctrine has been the fruit of speculation, or however it may have had its origin, this seems to be the door through which the enemy has come in upon us. The subtlety of the heresy is very great, both as it regards the humanity of our Lord and the holiness of the believer. But the first branch of the heresy virtually annuls the test

[8] Ib. p. 135. [9] Ib. p. 136. [1] Ib. p. 137.

of the Spirit, by enabling a false spirit to confess an incarnation without holding the truth of Christ come in the flesh. And the second branch challenges the possession of the Spirit in the *same fulness and power as he dwelt in Christ* . . . . One circumstance of these manifestations cannot but force itself upon observation; that is, the continual use which was made of the doctrine of *the second advent of our Lord.* This was the *leading theme* of the utterances. The *nearness* of it, its suddenness, and the fearful judgments which would accompany it, were the continual arguments which were used to excite our minds and stimulate our decision, as well as to support us under difficulties, and to induce us to lay all other things aside to further the work. The same thing has, as far as we are informed, attended every putting forth of assumed prophetic power from the earliest times."[2]

In the Preface to the second edition of this book he observes, "The leading persons, who for many months gave forth the prophetic utterances, and wrought the strong conviction of the work being of God, were two ladies" . . . who "were the instruments of laying the foundation of the system, *or rather building the system upon the foundation of false doctrine which Mr. Irving had previously developed.*"[3]

In connexion with these extracts, I would refer the reader to the Preface and Notes of the late reprint of "The General Delusion of Christians touching the ways of God's revealing himself,"[4] written by the Editor, who has there advocated the cause of the modern claimants to the prophetic character.

These statements emanating from one attached to the cause, and as there is good reason to suppose one of its principal supporters, may be regarded by the reader as indisputably containing the sentiments of the party. With

[2] Ib. pp. 138—142.

[3] Ib. p. xxviii.

[4] "The General Delusion of Christians touching the ways of God's revealing himself to and by the prophets. London, 1713; reprinted, London, 1832. 8vo." The editor of the reprint is said to be Mr. Henry Drummond.

respect to the usual *mode* of revelation, then, by prophetic persons, he considers that "the voice of the living God speaks through the organs of the prophets;"[5] and, *apparently*, while "the reasoning faculties" "are kept in abeyance."[6] He defends women prophesying in the church.[7] He asserts the doctrines above mentioned relating to our Lord's human nature and perfect holiness in the believer, speaking of "a holy God manifested in sinful humanity,"[8] and saying that "every child of God . . . . is responsible for perfect holiness."[9] In some parts of this statement he speaks only hypothetically of the claims of the party, as if he was not one of them, but so far is this from being the case, that in other parts he openly tells us, "There must be something peculiar in the state of the church at the time when 'the Lord arises to shake terribly the earth,' and to 'turn it upside down,' which *causes Him to caution* men against the whole body of pastors collectively, without limitation or exception." . . . . . "When the church has got into this state, the last expedient of God's ingenious benevolence is put forth in speaking Himself in a tongue unknown to men, as a sign of some other than the man's own spirit inhabiting the speaker." . . . . "According to the forms and ceremonies of the Church of England, to which her office-bearers cling with far greater tenacity than they do to what is more essential, the prophetic voice could not be heard; and therefore no minister who prefers his sect to God, as most do, dare permit its utterance. Hence the Church of England must come down in order to make room for it . . . God will pull her down."[1]

It is painful to observe the asperity and bitterness of spirit exhibited in this last passage, but it is mild compared with many others to be found in the context. Thus we are told,—"The Church . . . . is an adultress, and dreads the return of her Lord."—"If the gifts of the Spirit were now to be restored . . . it is nearly certain

[5] Ib. p. xiv.; and see p. xviii.
[6] Ib. note pp. 286, 287.
[7] Ib. p. xviii.
[8] Ib. p. xxii.
[9] Ib. p. xxvii.
[1] Ib. pp. xxviii. xxix. xxxii.

that the priesthood of every church, established and dissenting, would rise as one man against the manifestation of the Spirit in the gifted persons."—"If the gifts of the Spirit were to return in their former plenitude, there would be one grand simultaneous rising of *the whole Christian church* against them."—"The Times, the Morning Chronicle, the theatres, the caricature prints, the Christian Observer, the Evangelical Magazine; divines of every Calvinistic, and every Arminian hue; churchmen and schismatics; all, all are actuated by one and the same spirit on this point, and *all are agreed that the assertion of the Holy Ghost manifesting himself in the world, is not to be listened to nor inquired into, but to be put down by defamation, slander, and turmoil* . . . . They [i. e. "some of the evangelical body claiming to be more full of love and charity than others"] contented themselves with uniting with Taylor, who calls himself the Devil's chaplain, and with Carlile, the vender of atheism . . . . in repeating the very arguments, in reiterating the sneers, and in echoing the mockery, which open deniers of the God and Saviour of mankind had put forth."[2] Fortunately for the cause of truth most readers have it in their power at once to judge of the correctness of such statements as these; and all, of the spirit that prompted them. And why, it may be asked, is all this abuse heaped upon "the whole Christian church?" Simply because it has agreed to condemn certain doctrines and pretended revelations, put forth by a few individuals. By what process of reasoning, then, have these individuals found out, that they are right and "the whole Christian church" wrong? Their method of reasoning on the subject, as exhibited by our author, may perhaps explain this. After proving, though in a rather singular way, that the teaching of the Holy Spirit alone affords an adequate security against our being deceived by Satan, he adds, that if persons prophesy "by the Holy Spirit, all others who are partakers of the same Spirit also, will sympathize with those who speak; they will experience this sympathy, not

[2] Ib. pp. xii. xiii. xviii. xix. xxv.

so much by the verbal identity of the things uttered with the written word, although unless they be in such accordance, the spirit which dictates them cannot be divine, as by that secret unction of the Holy One by which they discern all things, and know the voice of the true from the voice of the false Shepherd. Thus the testimony to their own souls will be *independent* and *irrespective* of any forms of the intellect."[3]

Now, granting that there is some truth mixed up with this statement, it does not follow that a man is to judge of the claims of self-styled prophets, independently of those outward evidences of which the intellect can take cognizance; for this would remove the test of inspiration from those *evidences* by which Scripture teaches us to judge of it, and place it almost wholly in the *verdict supposed to be given* in a man's soul by the Spirit of God. It, in fact, makes it a matter of feeling, and not of reason; as if the teaching of the Holy Spirit on such subjects was rather the giving certain impulses and feelings to a man, than the enlightening his mind by giving him a *right standard* of judgment, and directing the exercise of its powers, so as to guide him to a *right decision.* And hence the practical effect of this is to cause every man who *thinks himself* to be taught by the Spirit to look almost exclusively to his internal *feelings* on the subject, to form a judgment upon it; and if firmly *convinced* that he *is* taught by the Spirit, and possessing an *internal feeling* in favour of the work, to look upon all who think otherwise as destitute of the Spirit. By this process of reasoning, then, the followers of this party having first taken for granted that they are persons taught of God upon the subject, and hence considering their feeling as carrying with it the weight of Divine authority, hold themselves entitled to call "the whole Christian church" to account for feeling differently. But, even according to their own showing, if evidences are to be disregarded, the first point to be ascertained is, *who have been taught of God in the matter*:

[3] Ib. p. xxiii.

and hence though Mr. Irving's feelings led him to admonish the General Assembly of the church of Scotland, and after the first and second admonitions to reject it,[4] it may turn out (and be more accordant with Scripture, Tit. iii. 10; Matt. xviii. 17,) that the *feelings* of the General Assembly were more correct, when they admonished and rejected *him*.

In the preceding extracts, we have, in the first place, a clear and decided testimony to that which is one of the strongest proofs of their not being prophets sent of God—the non-fulfilment of their predictions. To meet this *fact*, however, they, following the example of all their predecessors, have, no doubt, many ingenious replies ready.

We may notice, then, in the next place, that these claimants are involved in serious and awful doctrinal errors, as fully appears from the preceding statements. On this point many useful remarks occur in the "Narrative" itself; and as the principal subject of these errors has been already discussed in several able works, and rather demands a separate and independent consideration apart from any claims made by those who hold it, it will be sufficient here to refer the reader to the works already written on the subject,[5] only observing that such errors must be of themselves fatal to the supposed *prophetic* character of those who hold them.

But it is rather our present object to observe the *nature* of the supposed spiritual gifts in these persons; and from what has been stated above, we find that they are distinguished by the following characteristics:—

[4] See account of Mr. Irving's trial before the Presbytery of Annan, in the Record, the Times, and other papers, about the middle of March, 1833.

[5] See particularly Marcus Dods, On the Incarnation of the Divine Word. Mr. Irving's error on the human nature of our Lord was condemned long ago by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in the writings of Antonia Bourignon. Her sentiments on the subject may be seen in the "Apology for Antonia Bourignon." Lond. 1699, 8vo. The condemnation of them, and a statement of the doctrine which the General Assembly considered them to involve, are to be found in the "Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland" for 1701, Acts ix. x. xi. xii. See Compendium of Laws of Church of Scotland. Edinb. 1831, 12mo. Part 2, pp. 58—61.

1st. That these pretended prophets are principally women, and that these females speak in the church.

2nd. That the "tongue" spoken by them is not a real, or at least not a mundane language.

3rd. That the "tongue" is spoken to those who do not understand it, even where there is no interpreter present.

4th. That this "tongue" is not understood even by the speakers themselves, and is uttered by constraint, as if spoken in them by a superior power that used their organs of speech.

5th. That these pretended prophets prophesy as the mere passive organs of a superior power, by an involuntary and constrained utterance, and *without the instrumental intervention of the mind;* and often with the understanding in abeyance, unconscious of what the mouth is uttering.[6]

[6] It is evident from the preceding extracts, that the power supposed to be exercised upon the prophet was neither upon his will nor his understanding, but only upon his bodily frame and affections. This, to my mind, reasoning from analogy, settles the question as to the origin of the impulse, or at least, that it did not come from God. To enlighten the understanding in spiritual things, and effectually influence the will, are in God's power, and in his alone; and all his operations upon men are marked by these effects, and distinguished by them from those ingenious imitations of his works which human fancy or diabolical agency can produce. By the words "the instrumental intervention of the mind," I mean the mind of the prophet, having the message he is to deliver previously revealed to, and impressed upon, it, and then communicating it, in the same *way* as it communicates all other impressions made upon it, to others. This is clearly and confessedly not the case with the modern pretenders. In fact, although the more cautious among them may have now altered their notions in this respect, it was at first asserted that the mind of the prophet was altogether unconscious of what he spoke "in power." And it appears, from Mr. Baxter's Narrative, that this is still the case at times, and always as to what is delivered in "tongue." Nay, it seems that the greatest blessing which could happen to these prophets when prophesying, would be to get altogether rid of their understanding, for this, according to Mr. Irving, is the only hindrance to their delivering the message as they receive it. (Fraser's Mag. for March, 1832.) There would be much consolation at hand also in the loss of it, for, according to him, a man's "spirit" may "perceive" some spiritual matters quite independently of his understanding; (Morning Watch, vol. iii. p. 486, &c.;) when in fact the understanding is just that faculty of the spirit by which it perceives all ideal matters. But no, says Mr. Irving, "the mind, the understanding, and the feeling, or, as it is commonly called, the heart, is only a serving creature

These, as it appears to me, are the principal points in which the modern claimants are to be compared with the acknowledged prophets of the Old and New Testament; upon which, therefore, I proceed, in the next chapter, to consider the testimony borne respecting the latter by Scripture and the best writers on the subject.

In comparing these claimants subsequently with other cases of a similar kind, it will be desirable also to keep in mind some other characteristic points *accompanying* their manifestations, viz.—

The apparent (and, as I believe, real) sincerity and piety of at least many of them and their supporters—their marking themselves out as "the spiritual church," drawing the line of separation between the spiritual and nominal followers of Christ by the reception or rejection of their pretended gifts—their bitter denunciations against those who reject them—and the burden of all their warnings; the *near approach* of dreadful judgments and of the second advent of Christ to reign personally upon earth. Their expectations of the power of healing seem, according to their own testimony, never yet to have been realized; but as it is by no means improbable that they may yet lay claim at some future period to the possession of this power, we may also notice, when considering other cases, how far such a claim, even if made with some foundation, will go to prove its authors to be acting under the influence of the Divine Spirit.

—A THING OF THE FLESH, WITHOUT WHICH THE SPIRIT SHALL EXIST IN THE SEPARATE STATE—with which the spirit hath nothing to do but to keep it to its work, and entreat it kindly—from which the spirit is as widely separated as God is from the dust. God is the fountain of the spirit, the dust the origin of the fleshly creature." (Fraser's Mag. for March, 1832.) Alas! alas! into what depths of absurdity will such a delusion lead a man! But as the understanding is the best faculty of the soul, that which, when enlightened, makes a man capable of holding communion with his Maker, and thus raises him above the brute creation; so it is the object of Satan, not only to pervert its use, but even to bring it into discredit with man himself, and thus render him a more easy and willing victim to his devices.

CHAPTER II.

THE TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE AND THE BEST WRITERS, ANTIENT AND MODERN, RESPECTING SUCH GIFTS.

On such a subject, our first question must be, "What saith the Scripture?" (Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iv. 30.) "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. viii. 20.) The next, with every humble and sober-minded man, will be, What have been the generally-prevailing sentiments on these matters among good and great men of former times?

Let us, then, in the first place, consider the testimony of Scripture and the best writers, antient and modern, on each of the points we have mentioned as the characteristics of the modern claimants to the prophetic office.

And, *first*, with respect to women speaking *in the church*.

On this point we have the following express injunction of the apostle Paul. I quote the passage with the context, that it may be seen in what *connexion* it occurs, which is important to the obtaining a right view of its meaning. "If there be no interpreter, let him [a speaker in tongues] keep silence in the church, and let him speak to himself and to God. Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge. If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace. For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn and all may be comforted. And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints. Let your women

keep silence *in the churches;* for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home, *for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.*" (1 Cor. xiv. 29—35.) Nothing apparently can be more clear and decisive on the point than this passage; and it is confirmed by the language of the same apostle in his first Epistle to Timothy: "Let the women learn in silence, with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." (1 Tim. ii. 11, 12.) The prohibition is in express terms, without any reservation or qualification—"it is a shame for women to SPEAK in the church." And whether this prohibition included *speaking by the Spirit*, may be at once decided by any one who will examine the context; for, in the whole preceding part of the chapter, the apostle has been speaking of the use and abuse of spiritual gifts, speaking in tongues, prophesying, &c.; and, after giving the Corinthians certain directions respecting the right use of them, and admonishing them that "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets," he *immediately* adds, "Let your women keep silence in the churches," &c.

Against this *direct* testimony, one passage, and one only, is cited, where, in the 11th chapter of this Epistle, the apostle, without any express mention of time or place, speaks without animadversion of a woman praying and prophesying. "Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered, dishonoureth her head," &c. (1 Cor. xi. 4, 5.) It is hence *inferred*, that a woman may, under some circumstances, speak publicly in the church. Now, to make this passage answer the purpose, it must be ASSUMED that the apostle is here speaking of public assemblies of the church, that the praying and prophesying here mentioned signify *leading* the congregation in these exercises, and that the language used is *sufficient* to sanction the custom. On the

contrary, there is no sufficient evidence in the passage or its context, that it refers to a public meeting of the church; nor, if there were, do the words "praying and prophesying" necessarily signify *leading* the congregation in those exercises. The word "prophesying," which alone can create any difficulty, is allowed by all critics to be sometimes used in Scripture merely to express uttering hymns of praise to God, as it seems to be in the case of Zacharias. (Luke i. 67; see also Sept. translation of 1 Sam. x. 5, 6; and xix. 21.) And hence these words may be applied generally to the *whole congregation*. And further; they who suppose from this passage that a woman may, under some circumstances, speak publicly in the church, are constrained by the passage in the fourteenth chapter, to limit it to those occasions when she speaks by inspiration. Consequently it follows, that the praying and prophesying in the eleventh chapter must mean *exclusively* praying and prophesying *by inspiration*. But neither the context nor the passage itself will bear out this interpretation, for the apostle manifestly speaks *generally*, and as much of ordinary praying and prophesying as of inspired. This is evident in the passage already quoted, and perhaps still more in verses 13—15, "Judge in yourselves, is it comely that a woman PRAY UNTO GOD uncovered? Doth not even nature itself teach you, that if a man have long hair it is a shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her, for her hair is given her for a covering?" These words, and the argument in this and the preceding passage, against a man's praying or prophesying covered, and a woman's doing it uncovered, that it is a disgraceful thing, are perfectly general, not applying more to inspired than uninspired praying and prophesying, and so therefore must be the conclusion in verse 13. The apostle therefore is not speaking *exclusively* of inspired praying and prophesying, and therefore not of women speaking publicly in the church. But, were we even to yield these points, the passage affords no proof that the apostle allows the practice; for all that he would *then* assert here, in rebuke pro-

bably of something that had taken place at Corinth, is, that for women to speak in the church uncovered was *in itself* disgraceful; which is no *sanction* for their speaking there in any way, especially when coupled with the direct prohibition given afterwards in the 14th chapter.

At what time and place, and under what circumstances, inspired women were allowed to pray and prophesy for the benefit of others, (for that may be done publicly, and for the edification of others, which is not done *in the church*,) is another question. But it may not be irrelevant to observe, that it might be done as it was by Elizabeth, (Luke i. 41—45,) by Mary, (Luke i. 46—55,) by Anna, (Luke ii. 36—38;) it might be done in their families, with the young, and with the uninstructed as by Priscilla, (Acts xviii. 26;) it might be done in female assemblies of Christians, and *possibly* in *private* meetings, where men were present, and yet in none of these cases the apostolic injunction be infringed.[1]

On this point there has been, with the exception of the Quakers and some others, such a general consent among Christians in favour of the view here taken, that it is wholly unnecessary to refer to human testimony in support of it.

The *second* point for our consideration is, that, in opposition to the practice of the modern pretenders, the tongues spoken by the apostles and primitive Christians by the Spirit, were real languages of this world.

The word translated "tongue" in the passages of Scripture referring to this subject,[2] signifies *a language*, not *mere sounds*. The word "unknown," which occurs so often in connexion with it in the 14th chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians in our English translation, is not in the original, but added by the translators merely to express that the word used *implied* a language unknown to

[1] *Possibly* it is on this account that *angels* are mentioned in chapter xi. 10; because they might be supposed to be *always* present at such times, although men might not be, and therefore made the token of inferiority, according to Eastern usage, *always* proper.

[2] Γλωσσα.

the hearers. The expression "unknown tongue" occurs nowhere in the original Scriptures.

And these languages were languages of this world. At the first effusion of this gift, (Acts ii. 4—11,) the tongues spoken by the apostles were recognized by the strangers who heard them as their own tongues. "We do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God." (ver. 11.) And this is proved also by the language of the apostle in the chapter in which this whole subject is so much discussed, the 14th of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. There the apostle, *when speaking of the use of the gift of tongues*, says, "Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air. There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices *in the world*, and none of them is without signification. Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." (9—11.) Hence it follows, that the voices or sounds uttered by the early Christians were voices used and understood *somewhere in the world*, or, in other words, were *languages of this world.*

And in confirmation of this opinion, we may observe, that the gift when spoken of in the abstract is always described in the *plural* number. (See Mark xvi. 17; Acts ii. 4, and xix. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 30, and particularly xiv. 5, 6, 18, 22, 23, 39.) Nay, sometimes by a sort of double plural. It is a gift of "divers kinds of tongues," of "diversities of tongues." (1 Cor. xii. 10, 28.)[3] This shows, then, that the apostles and primitive Christians spoke real mundane languages, that could be distinguished one from another, otherwise they could not have known that they spoke more than one.

In opposition to this, however, the following passage is sometimes quoted: "He that speaketh in a tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God; for no man understandeth him." (1 Cor. xiv. 2.) The real meaning of this

[3] Γενη γλωσσων.

passage, however, may be at once understood from the context. The apostle is warning the Corinthians in this chapter, not to speak in a tongue given them by the Spirit, in their churches, because they would not be understood, unless there was one present who could interpret to their hearers what had been said. And in this verse, therefore, he very consistently observes,—he [a Corinthian] that speaks [to a Corinthian congregation] in a tongue given him by the Spirit, and not in his own language, speaketh not unto men but unto God, for no man, not one of his hearers, understandeth him. If a man was to go about London preaching or praying to English congregations in Persian or Arabic, we should very naturally say of him, he speaks not unto men but unto God, for no man understandeth him.

As it respects authorities for such an interpretation, I will venture to assert, and that not without some research, that hardly one, probably not one, respectable author can be found, antient or modern, who has not interpreted the tongues spoken by those early Christians by the Spirit to be real languages used in some part of the world. So much indeed was this felt to be the case by those who first pretended to this gift among the present claimants, that every effort was made to identify what was spoken with some known language, but in vain; and when this resource failed, it was by some modestly conjectured to be a celestial language, a conjecture that at once destroyed the supposed *similitude* between this case and that of the apostles, for the languages they spoke were mundane languages. It is now therefore allowed by some to be a "tongue unknown to men," and in this character is hailed as "the last expedient of God's ingenious benevolence" with his rebellious church.[4]

Observe, *thirdly*, that the languages spoken by the aid of the Spirit were only to be spoken to those, who either understood them, (Acts ii. 8,) or had one among them who either of his own knowledge, (Acts ii. 8,) or by pos-

[4] See Preface to "The General Delusion," p. xxviii.

sessing the gift of interpretation, (1 Cor. xii. 10,) could interpret them to the hearers.

"If any man," says the apostle, "speak in a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course, *and let one interpret.* BUT IF THERE BE NO INTERPRETER, LET HIM KEEP SILENCE IN THE CHURCH." (1 Cor. xiv. 27, 28.)

And in support of this *express* direction on the subject, almost the whole of the preceding part of the chapter is principally occupied with showing that the congregation were not edified by those who spoke in tongues, unless they were made to understand what was spoken. In proof of this, observe *particularly* verses 4, 5, 9—11 (quoted above, p. 54, at length,) and the following,—"When thou shalt bless with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest. For thou verily givest thanks well, *but the other is* NOT EDIFIED. I thank my God I speak with tongues more than ye all. Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, *that by my voice I might teach others also*, than ten thousand words in a tongue. Brethren, *be not children in understanding*," &c. (verses 16—20.) Our modern prophets, then, are deliberately imitating those who fell under an apostolic rebuke, *in the very point for which they were reproved.*

The following passage, however, has been noticed as implying the contrary. "If I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you *except* I shall speak to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine?" (ver. 6.) It has been urged from these words, that speaking with tongues unknown to the hearers, *if connected with* speaking by revelation or knowledge, &c. might be profitable. The simple answer is in the *direct negative* given to this supposition in the other parts of the chapter just noticed, and the consequence, that this is a false interpretation of the passage.[5]

[5] The meaning of this passage, connected with the context, appears to me to be clear;—Greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues,

Fourthly, it appears to the writer capable of most satisfactory proof, that the apostles and primitive Christians, when speaking in a tongue given them by the Spirit, always understood themselves what they uttered.

This is an important point, and I shall endeavour, 1st, to prove the truth of this conclusion, and then, 2ndly, to meet the objections that may be brought against it.

The truth of this conclusion may be proved thus:

The apostle says, "He that speaketh *in a tongue*,[6] speaketh *not unto men* but unto God, for *no man understandeth* him . . . . . but he that *prophesieth* speaketh unto men to *edification*," &c. (1 Cor. xiv. 2, 3.) Hence a man is *edified* only by that which he *understands*. So again in verse 5 of that chapter it is said, "I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied; for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he *interpret*, *that the church may receive edifying*." The church was not *edified*, except that which was spoken was spoken so that the church *understood* it. So again, ver. 9, "Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be *understood*, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air." Hence, except the audience *understood* the speaker, he spoke into the air; i. e. they were not *edified*. So again, ver. 16, 17, "Else," (i. e. if thou dost not interpret,) "when thou shalt bless with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say, amen, at thy giving of thanks, seeing he *understandeth not* what thou sayest? For thou verily

except he interpret, that the church may receive edifying. Now, for instance, brethren, if I, I who have the gift of tongues in the most excellent degree, come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you? My gift of tongues will be of no use to you. No, I shall profit you nothing by coming, except I shall speak to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine; in which case, understanding what I say, you will be edified by me; but would gain no edification from me by my speaking in a tongue which you did not understand.

[6] The word "*unknown*" is not in the original, but supplied by the English translators, and, therefore, whether appropriate or not, should be omitted here as a comment rather than a strict translation.

givest thanks well, but the other is *not edified.*" Hence a man is not edified by what is spoken in his presence, unless he understands it. From all these passages it clearly follows, that, according to St. Paul, a man is not edified by what he hears except he understands it. Now in ver. 4 of *the same chapter* the apostle says, "He that speaketh in a tongue *edifieth* himself." Hence I conclude, that he who spake in a tongue *understood* himself. The only reply, I believe, which can be offered to this is the following,—that though a man may not be edified by hearing another speak what he does not understand; yet that one who speaks under the immediate influence of the Spirit of God *may* be edified himself in uttering things unintelligible to him. The worth of this *fancy* might be safely left with most readers to determine for themselves. But in the same chapter, ver. 19, we have another, and even more precise and definite, word left on record on the subject than that in ver. 4. "In the church," says the apostle, "I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might *teach* others ALSO, than ten thousand words in a tongue." Hence he who spoke in a tongue *taught himself*, though he who spoke by his understanding taught *others* ALSO. Can it then be affirmed, that a man teaches himself by uttering words, of which he does not know the meaning?

Again, from verse 28, it appears that he who spoke in a tongue, spoke "TO *himself.*" How is it possible he could do this unless he understood himself?

So verse 11. "If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." Hence if a man does not know the meaning of what he says he is a barbarian, or foreigner, unto himself. On the contrary, in ver. 28, the apostle tells us, that he who spoke in a tongue spoke "TO *himself.*"[7]

[7] The word Βαρβαρος, *barbarian*, was in general use among the Greeks to denote one who spoke a strange or unknown language.—See Schleusner in v. and Dounæi Notæ in Chrysost. Op. Ed. Sav. v. 8. p. 2. col. 296, 297.

Further; the apostle, in verses 14—16, talks of a speaker in tongues "praying with the Spirit," "singing with the Spirit," "blessing with the Spirit." This can hardly be reconciled with the idea that the speaker did not understand what he said, for thus it would follow, that God, by the influence of his Spirit, enabled various persons to utter significant words of prayer, praise, &c., without communicating to them the meaning of those words; so that they did not know whether they were praying, singing, blessing, prophesying, or what, in fact, they were doing.

Let us now proceed, in the *second place*, to meet the objections that may be brought from Scripture against the conclusion to which we have come.

From 1 Cor. xiv. 5, 13, and 27, 28, severally, it is evident, that those who spoke in a tongue by the Spirit were not always able to interpret to their hearers what they had said. Hence it is inferred, that they did not understand it themselves at the time they spoke it. This is the most, and as it appears to me the only, plausible argument in support of this view of the subject. But let us consider whether the conclusion thus drawn is well-founded, and especially whether the evidence for it is strong enough to overthrow the weighty evidence we have already had of the contrary.

The understanding of one who spoke in a tongue by the Spirit was only *so far* in exercise as was necessary to receive certain impressions, and communicate them to others. Though it appears from this chapter, as we shall show presently, that he who possessed the gift was able to use it at pleasure, yet, the power of thus speaking being a gift of the Spirit, he did not speak by the exercise of his understanding, but by the exercise of the gift or power given him from above. What was uttered was not *produced* by an exercise of the understanding; the understanding was only exercised upon *it* when presented to it. Hence, as it regarded *the exercise of his understanding*, he was *very much* in the situation of one who is hearing *another* person

speak; and could have little, if any, greater advantage for interpretation, (supposing him not to possess the gift of interpretation,) than that which an Englishman who understands Latin would have for interpreting a Latin discourse after once hearing it. Now I would ask whether we should expect to hear from such a man a correct *interpretation* of the discourse he had just heard in Latin. No; it would be an almost unexampled effort of memory to give what could fairly be called an interpretation of it. Ask even a man who preaches *quite extempore* to preach over again the sermon he has just delivered, and how often would it be found that much of it had escaped from his memory. How much more, then, would this be the case, if the whole of the discourse had been uttered by him in a tongue not his own, by the exercise of a peculiar power given him by the Holy Spirit. It would not surely be at all wonderful that he should be unable to give in another language an interpretation of what he had thus spoken, or retrace that which had not been produced by an effort of his understanding.

Let the reader, then, fairly put it to himself, whether, under such circumstances, it follows that an inability to interpret proves that what was spoken was unintelligible to the speaker himself.

A similar conclusion has been drawn from 1 Cor. xiv. 14: "If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful." The latter words have been assumed to signify, "I do not understand what I say." Now the simple meaning of the Greek is, "My understanding *produces* nothing, *brings forth* no fruit." To convey the meaning assigned to it above, there should be, instead of the word there used, some word that would signify "*enjoys*, or *derives*, or *obtains*, no fruit." However plausible, therefore, the interpretation may appear to one who consults the English only, (though that is not an incorrect translation,) it is one which the original will not bear. The *meaning* of the phrase, also, seems to be very clear; the understanding in such a case is justly said to produce no-

thing, because the prayer uttered is not the produce of the understanding, but of the peculiar power or gift bestowed upon the speaker by the Spirit of God.[8]

[8] The passage with its context is as follows: "Seek that YE may excel to the edifying of the church. 13. Wherefore let HIM that speaketh in a tongue pray that HE may interpret. 14. For if I pray in a tongue, MY spirit prayeth, but MY understanding is unfruitful. 15. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also. 16. Else when THOU shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say amen at THY giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what THOU sayest? 17. For THOU verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified."—verses 12—17.

The various ways in which this passage has been interpreted, will, perhaps, be my excuse for offering the following; in the correctness of which, however, the question under discussion above is not involved. It will be observed that verses 14, 15, must be considered as a *parenthesis*; they are in a different person; nor can we without violence connect them immediately with verse 16, for in that verse the apostle resumes his exhortation to the *persons* whom he had been addressing in verses 13, 14. "Seek that YE may excel to the edifying of the church. Wherefore let him that speaketh in a tongue pray that he may interpret. Else [*i. e.* if thou dost not interpret] when THOU shalt bless with the spirit, how," &c. In this admonition the apostle (to give it the greater force) inserts *parenthetically* this remark; "For if I pray in a tongue by the Spirit of God, my spirit, it is true, prayeth, but my understanding, the best faculty of my soul, and upon which the greatest obligations lie to give its tribute of devotion to God, produces nothing. What conclusion, then, you will ask me, do I draw from this? Why this; that I will pray with (or, by) my spirit, not neglecting the gift that is in me, only taking care to use it in a befitting time and manner; and I will also pray by my understanding, offering the reasonable, useful, and befitting tribute of those prayers which my understanding, in the contemplation of the divine perfections and mercies, as displayed in his word and works, enables me to produce, and which you seem to hold too cheap. I will sing by my spirit, and I will sing by my understanding also." I change *with* to *by*, because in the original there is no preposition, but the dative case, signifying instrumentality, is used.

Many of the commentators interpret the phrase, "my understanding is unfruitful," (*ὁ νους μου ακαρπος εστι*) to mean, my understanding is unfruitful to others, or, brings forth no fruit in the edification of others. The first of these interpretations, however, involves an *addition* to the passage as it stands in the original. The meaning of *ακαρπος εστι* is simply "*produces no fruit*," and cannot mean, of itself, "*confers no fruit*." It includes *only* the idea of *production*, without any reference to the application, or benefits, or uses, of the fruit. Against the second, it may be fairly urged, that the edification of others cannot be called a fruit *of the mind*. It is a fruit,—not *of the mind itself*, but—*of the exercise of the mind*, or *of that which is produced*

There is one more passage which has been considered as favouring the view we have been endeavouring to refute, viz. verse 6 of this chapter; "If I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you except I shall speak to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine?" The inference deducible from this, that he who spake with tongues did not in so doing speak by knowledge, has been interpreted to mean that he did not know what he was saying. In reply to this, it is only necessary to observe, that the word translated *by* in this passage (εν) does not here mean *with*, but *by the instrumentality of*, as is evident from its application to "revelation," "prophesying," &c. It does not show, therefore, that he who spake with tongues did not speak with a knowledge of what he said *accompanying* his words, but only that he did not speak by the instrumentality of his knowledge, which it is clear he did not, because what he said was not the production of his own mind, but uttered by the exercise of the spiritual gift or power that he possessed.

These, as far as I can find, are the only testimonies brought forward from Scripture in support of the opinion, that the Christians who spoke in tongues in the early times did not understand what they said.

It is a remarkable fact, and well worthy the attention of those who are inclined to support such an interpretation of this chapter, that out of the numerous commentators who have written on it, almost the only ones who have adopted this interpretation are some Romanists, who have made it a

by the mind. The meaning in question would only be expressed by some word like ακαρπωτος or αχρηστος. In fact, it is evident, *both* that a man might speak by the spiritual gift, and thus his understanding produce nothing, and yet a hearer be benefited, who understood the language spoken; and *also*, that the understanding might be fruitful, and none of the hearers be benefited, as in the case of a man praying in a language known to himself, but unknown to his hearers.—Some respectable commentators have interpreted ὁ νους μου, to signify "*my meaning*." Surely this is more like cutting the knot than untying it. If any argument were wanted against it, verse 19 would supply it, where the words occur in exactly the same connexion, and on the same subject, and where they cannot be so interpreted without the most extravagant violence to the text.

ground of defence for their prayers being in Latin. Thus speaks Estius;—adopting, it will be observed (in the parts in italics) *the very same argument* now made use of by Mr. Irving and his party. On verse 4; "But if he who speaks in a tongue which he does not understand edifies himself, it is therefore not useless either to pray to, or to praise, God, in words not understood."[9] And on verse 14: "My mind, *i. e.* my intellect, not attaining the signification and meaning of the words, is deprived of its proper fruit, which is to understand, &c. . . . That of which the apostle speaks, happens to those who, ignorant of Latin, recite prayers in the Latin tongue; for *such, as far as regards the spirit and feeling of devotion, are carried out towards God*, if they pray with sincerity; but inasmuch as they do not understand the words, their mind is without fruit, *i. e.* the fruit of knowledge. . . . But such prayers are not on that account to be condemned . . . . . as useless. For although those who pray thus do not enjoy the fruit of knowledge, . . . yet they have the fruit of a mind elevated towards God. . . . They have also the fruit of a reverential regard towards holy prayers, which although they do not understand, yet they do not doubt that what is signified by them is good and salutary, and beg of God that this may be given them."[1]

In this interpretation some other Romanist commentators have found it convenient to agree; on which Beza, on verse 14, observes, that "it would be too absurd to believe that

[9] In v. 4; Quod si semetipsum ædificat is, qui loquitur lingua quam non intelligit, non igitur inutile est aut orare aut laudare Deum verbis non intellectis.

[1] In v. 14. Mens, id est, intellectus meus, quia verborum significationem ac sensum non assequitur, fructu proprio privatur, qui est intelligere, &c. . . Istud sane quod apostolus dicit, accidere constat iis, qui, Latinitatis ignari, Latino sermone preces recitant; hi namque spiritu quidem et affectu devotionis in Deum feruntur, si vere orant, sed quia verba non intelligunt mens eorum sine fructu est, videlicet intelligentiæ. . . .Verum non ob id damnandæ sunt precationes . . . . tanquam sint inutiles. Nam etiamsi qui sic orant fructum intelligentiæ non percipiant . . . habent tamen fructum mentis elevatæ in Deum. . . . Habent iidem etiam fructum reverentiæ erga preces sacras, quas etsi non intelligant, bonum tamen et salutare esse quod iis significatum non dubitant, atque hoc ipsum sibi petunt a Deo donari.

THE HOLY SPIRIT EVER MOVED ANY ONE TO DO THAT, nor can such things be called prayers, but mere mockeries of God and the church."[2] And on verse 11, that it "was a barbarism unheard of in all former ages, by which . . . . they become barbarians to themselves, who use a language unknown to themselves."[3]

The former of these quotations, it will be observed, conveys to us Beza's opinion on *the very point* now under discussion. In fact, *all* the *Protestant* commentators, with, as far as I can find, only one exception, interpret the chapter so as to show, more or less directly, that they considered that those who spoke in a tongue, understood themselves what they spake. Calvin expressly says, on verse 14, "For it is not credible (at any rate we nowhere read of such a thing) that any spoke under the influence of the Spirit, in a tongue unknown to themselves."[4]

And so Whitby on the same verse; "He therefore understood himself, as the church did him that prophesied. And indeed by speaking what he himself understood not, he would have been as much a barbarian and unprofitable to himself as he was to others. To say with Cajetan, *The words were pious which he uttered, and he had pious affections when he uttered them*, is unsatisfactory; for what if the matter of them was so, since, if he understood them no more than a parrot, his piety in speaking of them could be no more than that of a parrot; he neither could know they were pious, nor receive any benefit by them, supposing they were so, whilst he understood nothing of them; nor could any pious affections be raised in him by words not understood. To say with Grotius, *sentit in se vim Christi*, he perceives the gift of Christ operating in

[2] Nimis foret absurdum credere Spiritum Sanctum hoc unquam cuiquam dictasse ut faceret; nec possunt ista dici preces, sed mera Dei et Ecclesiæ ludibria.

[3] Inauditum antea omnibus sæculis barbarismum . . . . quo fit, ut sibi ipsis quoque sint barbari, qui ne sibi quidem ipsis cognita lingua utuntur.

[4] Neque enim credibile est (saltem nusquam legimus) loquutos fuisse ullos Spiritus impulsu lingua sibi incognita.

him, if he perceived not the meaning of his own words, is to talk as unintelligibly as he spake; for that can only signify, he knew he had the gift of tongues, which sure could not much edify him who formerly had used that gift, and so could not be ignorant he had the gift. Moreover, doth not the apostle bid him who speaks with tongues not interpreted, *speak only to himself and to God*, verse 28, and can he speak to himself more than to others who understandeth not himself? or is it fit that he should speak to God he knows not what? However, it is certain that the apostle not only dislikes, but plainly forbids this way of speaking in the church, verse 28."

The quotation from Grotius is, indeed, an unsatisfactory exposition of the passage, but his notes on verses 5 and 13, show that he was of opinion that they who spake with tongues, understood themselves what they said.

Among the antients, the only one of note that can be referred to as countenancing the opinion we have endeavoured to refute, is Chrysostom, and his testimony on the point is remarkably contradictory, for on verse 4 he expressly asserts that the verse must be interpreted of those who understood what they said in the tongue. His words are these; "'He that speaks in a tongue edifies himself.' And how can this be the case unless he understands what he says? But then he is speaking of those who understand themselves what they say, but are not able to interpret it to others."[5] And so on the 10th verse of the 12th chapter, he says, "'To another divers kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues.' For the former, while he knew himself what he said, was unable to interpret it to another, but the latter possessed both these gifts, or the other (or latter) of them."[6] On the contrary, however, he in-

[5] Ὁ λαλων γλωσση ἑαυτον οικοδομει. Και πως, ει μη οιδεν ἁ λεγει; αλλα τεως περι ειδοτων ἁ λεγουσι διαλεγεται, ειδοτων μεν αυτων, ουκ επισταμενων δε εις ἑτερους εξενεγκειν. Chrys. Op. Ed. Sav. vol. iii. p. 474.

[6] Αλλω δε γενη γλωσσων, αλλω δε ἑρμηνεια γλωσσων· ὁ μεν γαρ ηδει το τι ελεγεν αυτος, ἑτερω δε ἑρμηνευσαι ουκ ηδυνατο· ὁ δε και αμφοτερα ταυτα εκεκτητο, η τουτων θατερον. Chrys. Op. Ed. Sav. vol. iii. p. 433.

terprets " my mind is unfruitful," (chap. xiv. verse 14,) to mean my mind is ignorant of what I am saying; adding that there were *formerly* (το παλαιον) those who could utter a prayer in the Roman or Persian language without understanding themselves the words they uttered;—a most unsupported testimony, by the way, and as his own words show, resting only upon the authority of a *report* of what had taken place (if it ever took place) very many years before.

The only other author of this period who has interpreted the verse in this way is Primasius of the sixth century. The commentary of Theophylact, of the eleventh century, on the whole epistle, is merely an abridgment of Chrysostom's.[7]

On the other side we have Theodoret of the early part of the fifth century, nearly contemporary with Chrysostom, the learned Photius of the 9th century, (preserved in Œcumenius,) and the incidental comments on parts of this chapter by two earlier Fathers than any yet mentioned, viz. Epiphanius of Constantia, and Basil the Great, who flourished about the years 358 and 370 respectively. The former of these in his book against Heresies, speaking of a false reading put forth by Marcion of the 19th verse, says, " You see how the holy apostle speaks concerning tongues; *yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding*, that is, by interpretation. As the prophet bringing to light the things previously infused into his understanding by the Holy Spirit profits his hearers by his prophecy, so I, he says, wish to speak by a language which the church understands, so that it may hear and be

[7] There is a passage of Augustine in his De Genes. ad literam, lib. xii. cc. 7, 8, sometimes referred to as giving the same testimony, in which, taking the passage out of its context to support a particular notion, he interprets the tongue *in this particular place* to mean " obscure and mystic expressions" (" obscuras et mysticas significationes"); but there is no evidence to show that he considered the speaker in tongues to remain ignorant of the meaning of what he said; but the contrary, for he says in the same passage, that " no one is edified by hearing that which he does not understand," when he knew from the apostle that the speaker in tongues " edified himself."

edified; and not by a vain-glorious exhibition of Greek and Hebrew to EDIFY MYSELF, WHO UNDERSTAND WHAT I AM SAYING, and not the church.[8]

The comment of Basil is on the 14th verse, and is to be found in his book of "Compendious Rules" drawn up in the way of question and answer, and may be worth quoting entire:

"Question 278.—How does the spirit of any one pray when the understanding is unfruitful?

"Answer.—This was spoken of those who utter prayers in a tongue unknown to the hearers. For he says, [*i. e.* St. Paul,] If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my understanding is unfruitful. For when the words of a prayer are unknown to those present, the understanding of the person praying is unfruitful, no one being benefited. But when those present understand the prayer, so that it is calculated to benefit the hearers, then the person who prays has fruit in the advantage gained by those who profit by it. And the case is the same with respect to every promulgation of the words of God. For it is written, *but that which is good to the edification of faith.*" [alluding to Eph. iv. 29.][9]

Nor is the testimony of the author of the Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, formerly attributed to Ambrose, but

[8] Ὁρας πως διηγειται περι γλωσσων ὁ ἁγιος Αποστολος. Αλλα θελω πεντε λογους εν Εκκλησια τω νοι μου, τουτεστι δια της ἑρμηνειας, φρασαι. Ὡς ὁ προφητης εν Πνευματι Ἁγιω εις τον νουν προκεχορηγημενα φερων εις φως, δια της προφητειας ωφελει τους ακουοντας· Ουτως καγω, φησι, λαλησαι εις ακοην της Εκκλησιας, και οικοδομην, και μη δια του κομπου Ἑλληνιδος και Εβραιδος ἑαυτον οικοδομειν τον ειδοτα, και ουχι την Εκκλησιαν, δι' ἡς επισταται γλωσσης. Epiphan. Adv. Hæres. in hæres. xlii. adv. Marcionist. Ed. Paris, 1622. vol. 1. p. 362.

[9] Ερωτ· σοή. Πως το πνευμα τινος προσευχεται, ὁ δε νους ακαρπος εστιν; Αποκρισις. Τουτο περι των εν γλωσση αγνοουμενη τοις ακουουσι τας προσευχας αναπεμποντων ερρηθη. Φησι γαρ, εαν προσευχωμαι γλωσση, το πνευμα μου προσευχεται, ὁ δε νους μου ακαρπος εστιν. Ὁταν μεν γαρ αγνωστα η τοις παρουσι τα ῥηματα της προσευχης, ακαρπος εστιν ὁ νους του προσευχομενου, μηδενος ωφελουμενου. Ὁταν δε ὁι παροντες νωσι την προσευχην ωφελειν δυναμενην τους ακουοντας, τοτε ὁ προσευχομενος καρπον εχει την των ωφελουμενων βελτιωσιν. Ὁμοιως δε και επι πασης εκφωνησεως των του Θεου ῥηματων. Γεγραπται γαρ, αλλ' ει τις αγαθος προς οικοδομην της πιστεως. [Eph. iv. 29.] Basil. Regul. Brevior. Ed. Paris. 1618, vol. ii. p. 641. Observe the *reading* of Eph. iv. 29.

now universally allowed to have been written by Hilary the Deacon,[1] (about the year 380) adverse to this interpretation; for he attempts to solve the difficulty by distinguishing between the natural mind, and what he calls the spirit given in baptism, of which, though he thinks the former to have remained ignorant of the meaning of what was said in the tongue, yet the latter he expressly asserts knew the meaning of it, so that, whatever may be thought of his interpretation, it is evident that he considered the speaker in tongues to understand what he uttered.

Moreover, that the primitive speakers in tongues had no constraining power acting upon their bodily organs when thus speaking, is capable of positive proof. That they had it altogether in their own power to speak or to be silent, and therefore were not *irresistibly* moved, is proved *incontrovertibly* by this single verse. "If there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church, and let him speak to himself and to God." (ver. 28.) The speaker in tongues therefore was to judge for himself from circumstances, whether it was expedient to speak or not, and to act accordingly, and consequently was altogether a *free agent* in the matter. Nay; after the first bestowal of the gift, it was exercised without *any immediate* impulse from the Spirit at all, for the Corinthian speakers in tongues are reproved by the apostle for using the gift at improper times, (see verses 26—28,) which is utterly irreconcilable with the idea of their speaking by a constraint immediately proceeding from the Holy Spirit, for a reproof of these speakers in such a case would have been equivalent to reproving the Holy Spirit that spake by them.

And hence we learn, not only that there was no actual constraint laid upon the bodily organs of the speaker in tongues which produced his utterance, but, on the contrary, that the gift of a tongue or tongues, *when once infused*, remained with a person *in such a way* as that he could exercise it when he pleased, for it could not have been by any

[1] See Walchii Biblioth. Patrist. p. 351, and Cave Hist. Liter. sub. nom. "Hilarius Diaconus."

constraining power proceeding from the Holy Spirit that he used the gift at improper times.

So far, then, was the Holy Spirit from *speaking the tongue in them,* that after the first reception of the gift they spoke so independently of any immediate illapse of the Spirit prompting them thereto, that they sometimes spoke *against his will,* to the confusion of the church.

There remains one more, and that the most important point for our consideration, in disproof of the claims we are now investigating, viz. that (as I shall endeavour to prove in opposition to the *fifth* characteristic of our modern self-styled prophets) none of the Old or New Testament prophets prophesied as the mere passive organs of the Holy Spirit's utterance, but always as perfectly free agents, and without any *the least* constraint upon their organs of speech, with a full consciousness of the literal meaning of what they said, and able, both when receiving and delivering a prophecy, to exercise their reasoning faculties upon it, THEIR MINDS BEING USED AS INSTRUMENTS FOR THE CONVEYANCE OF THE MESSAGE.

This question appears to have been often mixed up and almost identified by some modern writers with another, which has no necessary connexion with it, viz. whether the prophets spoke under bodily agitations. This inquiry seems to me to be one of secondary importance, and one which could terminate in no satisfactory result, because the information which we could now obtain on the subject would not be sufficient to produce an agreement on it, in minds whose standard of propriety in such things differed. That the prophets prophesied occasionally with some degree of bodily agitation and gesticulation when uttering their solemn warnings and awful messages of impending wrath, is far from improbable, and passages no doubt there are which imply as much as this; and this some might *choose to suppose* was of a similar kind to those of the modern prophets, or of the French and English prophets of the last century, and no *reasoning* probably would drive them from that conclusion. So little is said even indirectly

bearing on the subject, that no certain limits can be affixed, or any definite conclusion formed respecting it, and every man will interpret the remote allusions to it he can find, according to his own judgment and views of propriety. They, therefore, who think that violent bodily agitations are not very likely indications of the presence of the Holy Spirit, will find nothing in Scripture to shake them in that conclusion, while they who think that, "let the outward actions of a prophet be as extravagant as those of fools and madmen, yet even these do directly tend to the reverence of God by impressing the greater certainty of a spirit's agency, whilst the habitual sobriety and good judgment of the man at other times, shows it does not vitiate his brain,"[2] will probably be satisfied in finding that the prophets had sometimes bodily agitations, which, for aught they can find or think likely, were as violent as those they wish to sanction. On this point, therefore, it is hardly worth while to enlarge here, especially as the Editor of the work just quoted, makes the following remark on the subject of prophetic agitations. After observing that "our blessed Lord, who is our only model and example, spake always with perfect calmness and placidity, giving forth words of pure wisdom," he adds, "Far too much is made of these mere circumstantials; in no case is any thing of the sort to be taken as a test; and, *cæteris paribus*, UNBECOMING CONTORTIONS OF THE FRAME ARE SUSPICIOUS AT LEAST."[3]

The point, then, to which I would beg the reader's attention is this: that the prophets always spoke as perfectly free agents, and without any *the least* constraint upon their organs of speech, with a full consciousness of the literal meaning of what they said, and able, both when receiving

[2] "The General Delusion of Christians," &c. Ed. 1832, p. 109, in which work, pp. 99—115, may be seen the arguments generally adduced in favour of such prophetic agitations. Also in Sir R. Bulkley's "Answer to several Treatises lately published on the subject of the Prophets. Pt. 1. Lond. 1708." 8vo., which was replied to in "A brief Vindication of the Antient Prophets, in a letter to Sir R. Bulkley. Lond. 1709." 8vo.

[3] "General Delusion of Christians," &c. Ed. 1832, p. 284, note by Editor.

and delivering a prophecy, to exercise their reasoning faculties upon it; *their minds being used as instruments for the conveyance of the message.*

First, then; that there was no constraining influence upon their bodily organs producing an utterance of their prophecies, is clear from the language in which God addresses them as to the delivery of their message, as well as from many recorded circumstances attending the delivery. Thus, not only do we find frequent exhortations to them to deliver the word which they had received, (see Num. xxii. 35; Jer. i. 7, 8; Ezek. ii. 6—8, &c. &c.,) which appear utterly unnecessary if they were the mere organs of the Holy Spirit, but also supposed cases of disobedience in delivering the message, as in the following, among several, passages that might be mentioned. "Hear the word at my mouth and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die, and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way," &c. (Ezek. iii. 17, 18; repeated xxxiii. 7—9.) What can be clearer, then, from hence, than that the prophet was a perfectly free agent in delivering his message, and that he was subject to *no* force or influence beyond the moral influence of those motives which a spirit of love and obedience to God might supply. So we find Jeremiah making a resolution, "I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name," which would have been absurd, had it not been in his own power to speak or not; and when he afterwards declares that his mind was so excited by the messages given him to deliver, that his resolution gave way; he says, he "was weary with *forbearing*," an expression that could apply only to a free agent. (See Jer. xx. 9.

Nay, as a still stronger proof of this, we have, in the case of Jonah, an actual example of a prophet, after having received his commission and message, neglecting and concealing them. "The word of the Lord came unto Jonah . . . saying, Arise, go to Nineveh and cry against it . . . But Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish, from the presence of

the Lord." (Jon. i. 1—3.) Here, then, at least, was no *irresistible* impulse to speak upon Jonah, and that the prophetic message was delivered to him at this time is evident from chapter iv. 2.[4] And how is this conduct met? God follows him in his providence, and, by a series of acts of judgment and mercy, brings him to repentance, and bows his *will* to submit to the Divine command, and deliver the message with which he had been entrusted, which he delivers, be it observed, not when it is impressed upon his own mind by the Spirit, because he is not then present at the spot, but some time after. (Jon. iii. 1—4.) He delivers his message, like all the other prophets, from the impressions *previously* made upon his own mind by the Spirit.

That the prophets of the New Testament also were in the same way perfectly free agents, and had *no* supernatural power acting upon *their organs of speech*, when prophesying, is evident from the following passages in the chapter from which we have already quoted so much: "Let the prophets," the apostle says, "speak two or three, and let the other judge. *If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace.*" (1 Cor. xiv. 29, 30.) And again, even more expressly, "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." (ver. 32.)

The same may be observed, also, with respect to those revelations that were made during a state of rapture. Thus, in the celebrated rapture of Isaiah, (Is. vi.) God says to him, "Go and tell this people,"—words that clearly imply a free agent, and that he was to communicate the message in the natural way; nor was the message recorded under the excitement of this state, but afterwards, for he says at the commencement of his account of this scene, "*In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw,*" &c. So also in St. Peter's trance, recorded Acts x. 9—16, when he *afterwards* communicated the vision to the apostles for the instruction of the church, (Acts xi. 1—10,) he evidently does it as a perfectly free agent. He is called upon for an explanation

[4] The Sept. translate ch. iii. 2, so as to prove this; they translate it, "the preaching which I *have* delivered to thee" (κηρυγμα ὁ εγω ελαλησα προς σε).

of his conduct, and he "rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it by order unto them, saying," &c. (ver. 4.) So St. John wrote his Revelations, *after the supernatural influence of the Spirit upon him* by which he had been enabled to receive them, *had been removed;* for he says, "I WAS (εγενομην) in the Spirit." (Rev. i. 10.)

For this view of the scriptural mode of prophesying we have the universal consent of the primitive catholic Church, elicited principally in the controversy with the Montanists, as we shall see more fully in the next chapter; on which account I shall only, in this place, quote a few words from the testimonies (there more fully given) of Origen, Jerome, and Chrysostom.

"The prophets [says Origen] did not, as some suppose, lose their understanding, and *speak from an irresistible impulse of the Spirit.* 'If any thing be revealed to another,' &c. [1 Cor. xiv. 30.] By which it is shown that he who speaks has the power to speak when he pleases, and to be silent when he pleases." . . . . . "'The word of the Lord came unto him, saying, Son of man, cause Jerusalem to know her abominations, and say, Thus saith the Lord.' [Ezek. xvi. 1, 2.] The Lord placed it not in a constraining impulse of inspiration, but in the will of the speaker, that he should testify to Jerusalem her abominations. . . . It was in the power of the prophet, who heard the command, *Say*, whether he should speak or not, as it was placed in the power of Jonah." &c. &c.[5]

So he explains, 1 Cor. xiv. 32, as showing that "one who has the spirit of prophecy is not constrained to speak involuntarily, *as those who have unclean spirits*, but speaks *when he pleases* and reason requires," &c.[6]

So Chrysostom lays it down as "the peculiar mark of a soothsayer to be in an ecstasy, to suffer constraint, to be under a violent impulse . . . but a prophet is not so, but speaks every thing with a sober judgment and a sound state of mind. . . . . They [the prophets] had it in their own

[5] Orig. in Ezek. Hom. 6. See the whole passage and original below, ch. iii.
[6] Orig. in Rom. See below, ch. iii.

power either to speak or not to speak, for they were not impelled by force, but were honoured with power. Through this it was that Jonah fled; [Jon. i. 3;] through this, that Ezekiel was lifted up; [Ezek. iii. 14;] through this that Jeremiah deprecated at first his divine mission. [Jer. i. 6.] For God did not impel them [to speak] by constraint, but by counselling, exhorting, threatening, them," &c.[7]

The same testimony is borne by Jerome. "'The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets;' so that they have it in their own power when to be silent and when to speak; and if this conclusion appears not well founded to any one, let him mark that saying of the same apostle, 'Let the prophets speak two or three,' &c. [1 Cor. xiv. 29, 30.] How can they hold their peace, if it is in the power of the spirit who speaks by the prophets either to be silent or to speak?"[8]

And he again explains this passage in the same way in another part of his commentaries.[9]

In the next place, we have to prove that the prophets were always conscious of the *general* meaning of the prophecies they uttered, and were able, when receiving, and therefore certainly when delivering, them, to exercise their reasoning faculties upon them.

That this is not always the case with the modern claimants, is evident from the extracts given in the first chapter, and, in fact, is never the case when "the tongue" is spoken. And the capability of exercising their reasoning faculties upon their prophecies, while receiving or delivering them, (which with *them* are identical) seems universally denied by them.[1]

[7] Chrysost. in 1 Cor. Hom. 29. See below, ch. iii.

[8] Hieron. Pref. in Comm. in Isa. See below, ch. iii.

[9] Hieron. Pref. in Comm. in Habak. See below, ch. iii.

[1] There is not a little contradiction in the way in which they often speak on this subject. As an instance of this, I cannot but allude to a note of the Editor of "The General Delusion of Christians," &c. before referred to, pp. 286, 7; from which it evidently follows, that he thinks that "the reasoning faculties" may be "kept in abeyance," while they are not "totally suspended;" and that persons who are "possessed of the Holy Ghost" may have their reasoning

To guard against misconception, I must observe, that I do not mean here to assert, that the prophets understood the exact way or the time in which their prophecies were to be fulfilled, nor sometimes their *full prophetic* meaning, for this appears to me more than improbable. We find Daniel, after describing one of his visions, saying, "I heard, but I understood not." But that this does not mean that he was unconscious of what the angel had revealed to him in its general nature and character, and as far as the words could be interpreted by his own *enlightened* reason, is evident from the words with which the revelation is introduced in chap. x.; and from what immediately follows,—"Then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?" (Dan. xii. 8.) It is not impossible, nay, indeed, probable, that their case was very similar to that of the apostles when our Lord first revealed to them the scenes of suffering through which he had to pass. "They understood," it is said, "none of these things; and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken." (Luke xviii. 34. Compare Luke ix. 45, Mark ix. 32.) But that this inability to understand what was said did not apply to the general meaning of the words will not be denied, and is evident from the fact, that when these things were first mentioned by our Lord to his disciples, "Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from

faculties thus kept in abeyance, and yet be "conscious of what they are saying, so as to be tempted to use their own words instead of those the Spirit *makes them* utter." How a man can be "tempted to use his own words," and utter admonitions and prophecies made by himself while his "reasoning faculties" are "kept in abeyance," is inconceivable. In short, all this self-contradiction is the consequence of the πρωτον ψευδος, the primary false principle, that the announcements of the prophets were made personally by the Holy Spirit using the bodily organs of the prophets. The same contradiction is observable in Mr. Irving's statements, united occasionally with attempts at metaphysical subtilties which I will not attempt to describe. (See Fraser's Magazine for March, 1832.) His last published observation, however, on this subject is in his paper in the Morning Watch for March, 1833, on what he calls "Mr. Baxter's fall," one cause of which, he tells us, was, *Mr. B.'s attempting to understand his own utterances*, adding, "*Did ever Isaiah think of comprehending what the lips of Isaiah spake?*"

thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee." (Matt. xvi. 22. Compare Mark viii. 33.) The literal meaning of the words was evident to them, and therefore the general nature of the prophecy; but *how* it was to be fulfilled they could not comprehend. This was cleared to them only by the event; when this came to pass, then they "remembered his words," and could then, and not till then, (unlike the bold expositors of modern times,) attach to the prophecy its *full prophetic* signification. (See Luke xxiv. 6—8.) So in that prophecy of our Lord, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," the disciples, while of course they understood the literal meaning of the words, and perhaps their reference to Jesus Christ, seem to have had no idea of the exact way in which they were to be accomplished till the prophecy was fulfilled. (See John ii. 19—22.) Such may very probably have been the case with the prophets. As the incarnate Saviour revealed to his disciples personally certain prophetic intimations, of which they might be the bearers to others, and of which both the and their hearers might remain ignorant of the *full prophetic* meaning till the accomplishment, which would, when it came to pass, tend much to strengthen their faith in God's word; (see John ii. 22;) so the Holy Spirit appears to have given the prophets those mysterious intimations of future events which God saw fit to reveal through them to mankind, the *full prophetic* signification of which, as it regards *the individuals*, *the exact time*, *manner* and *attendant circumstances* in which they are to be fulfilled, is only to be *understood* by the accomplishment. (See 1 Peter i. 10—12.)

Thus, for instance, notwithstanding the remarkable and clear prophecies of the Old Testament relating to the calling of the Gentiles, the apostle Paul says, that in other ages it had not been made known unto the sons of men as it was then revealed unto the holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, &c. (Eph. iii. 4—6.)

Nevertheless, this is perfectly reconcilable, as the case

already mentioned amply proves, with the notion that the prophets were perfectly conscious of what they were saying, and the general meaning of their prophecies.

The revelations given by God to the prophets were communicated to them in two ways, by *vision* and by *word*, which in some cases appear to have been united. Let us observe, then, first, the testimonies we have to the mind of the prophet retaining and exercising its powers in *visions*, and not being "kept in abeyance."

Take the case of Isaiah in his celebrated vision recorded in the sixth chapter of his prophecy. "In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne," &c.—he proceeds to describe the scene presented to him—"*Then said I*, Woe is me for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips . . . for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts. Then flew one of the seraphims unto me," &c. . . . "Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? *Then said I, here am I, send me.* And he said, Go and tell this people," &c. . . . "*Then said I, Lord, how long?* And he answered," &c. (Isaiah vi.)

Is it possible, then, to disunite from this relation the idea that the mind of the prophet was perfectly conscious of all that passed in this vision, when we find it actually exercising itself in observations upon the objects presented to it, and putting itself forth in questions and replies, even while under the immediate influence of the vision?

The same consciousness and activity of mind in vision is evident in the following instances, occurring in the person of Ezekiel. The first is the vision of the dry bones, which he thus describes: "The hand of the Lord was upon me, . . . and set me down in the valley of dry bones . . . And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? And I answered, O Lord God, thou knowest. Again he said unto me, Prophesy upon these bones and say unto them, &c. . . . *So I prophesied as I was commanded* . . . Then said he unto me, Prophesy unto the wind, &c. . . . . *So I prophesied as he commanded me*," &c. &c. (See Ezek. xxxvii.

1—12, and compare xliii. 3—7, and xlvii. 6, 7.) Again; mark the words of the angel to Ezekiel when directing his attention to the vision of the temple. "The man said unto me, Son of man, behold with thine eyes, and hear with thine ears, *and set thine heart upon all that I shall show thee*, for to the intent that I might show them unto thee art thou brought hither; *declare all that thou seest to the house of Israel*." (Ezek. xl. 4.) And in the progress of it we find him thus addressed by God: "The Lord said unto me, Son of man, *mark well*, and *behold with thine eyes*, and *hear with thine ears*, *all that I say unto thee* concerning all the ordinances of the house of the Lord, and all the laws thereof; . . . and thou shalt say to the rebellious, Thus saith the Lord God," &c. (Ezek. xliv. 5, 6.)

In the case of Daniel there are numerous instances of this kind. Both the dream of Nebuchadnezzar and its interpretation were "revealed unto Daniel in a night vision," and he *afterwards* reveals it to Nebuchadnezzar. (See Dan. ii. 19, 30, 31, &c.) Observe also the language he uses as to his visions;—"I saw in my vision by night, and behold, &c. . . . *I considered* the horns, and behold, &c. . . . . I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things. . . . . Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast. . . . . Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be, &c. . . Hitherto is the end of the matter. As for me, Daniel, my COGITATIONS much troubled me, and my countenance changed in me; but I kept the matter in my heart." (Dan. vii. 2, 8, 16, 19, 23, 28.) "I saw in a vision, &c. . . . . And *as I was considering*, behold an he-goat came, &c. . . . . And it came to pass, when I . . . had *seen the vision*, *and sought for the meaning*, then behold there stood before me," &c.; and then follows a revelation of the *full prophetic* meaning of the vision and the *persons* whom it represented. (Dan. viii. 2, 5, 15 &s.) "In the third year of Cyrus . . . a thing was revealed unto Daniel . . . and he *understood* the thing

and *had understanding of the vision.*" *Now this vision was one that so powerfully affected him that he says,* "*I . . saw this great vision, and there remained no strength in me; for my comeliness was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength.*" "YET," he adds, "heard I the voice of his words . . . . and he said unto me, O Daniel, . . . *understand the words that I speak unto thee.* . . . I am come to make thee *understand* what shall befall thy people . . . then I opened my mouth and spake, and said unto him that stood before me, O my Lord, by the vision my sorrows are turned upon me, and I have retained no strength . . . neither is there breath left in me . . . . Then there came again and touched me, one like the appearance of a man, and he strengthened me; and said, O man greatly beloved, fear not; peace be unto thee, be strong, yea, be strong. And when he had spoken unto me I was strengthened, and said, Let my Lord speak, for thou hast strengthened me. Then said he," &c. (Dan. x. 1, 8, 9, 11, 16—20.) There is every evidence here of the most perfect consciousness and activity of mind, even under the effects of a vision more than ordinarily striking and overpowering.

Various testimonies of a similar kind may be found in the writings of the other prophets. Thus we find Amos conversing with God in vision. (See Amos vii. 7, 8, and viii. 1, 2.) To the prophet Habakkuk God on one occasion, after revealing a vision, gives him this direction;—"Write the vision, *and make it plain* upon tables, that he may run that readeth it." (Habak. ii. 2.) In the case of Zechariah, also, we have a complete testimony to his consciousness in vision in several parts of his book. (See i. 18—21, ii. 1—3, iv. v. vi. 1—8.) Particularly where it is said, that he asked the angel what some things in the vision represented, and the angel answered, "*Knowest thou not what these be?*" which occurs twice; (iv. 4, 5, 12, 13;) for both the answer and the reply show that his mind was perfectly conscious of all that was passing, and could reason upon it. The same thing is observable also

in *many* parts of the book of Revelation. We may observe also, that the cases of Elisha and his servant, and of St. Paul in his journey to Damascus, and of Ananias, (2 Kings vi. 16, 17; and Acts ix. 3—8, and xxii. 9, and ix. 10—17,) fully exhibit perfect consciousness in vision.

We have next to show, that in the other kind of revelation to the prophets, viz. that by a communication of the *word* of prophecy, the mind of the prophet was conscious of the general meaning of the words of the prophecy, and was not kept in abeyance, but retained and exercised all its powers while under the influence of the Spirit.

Among other passages establishing this point we may notice the following. The introduction of Jeremiah to the prophetic office is thus described: "The word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, . . . and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations. Then said I, Ah! Lord God! behold I cannot speak, for I am a child. But the Lord said unto me, Say not, I am a child; for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I *command thee thou shalt speak.* Be not afraid of their faces, for I am with thee," &c. (Jer. i. 4—8.) Now this narrative contains more than one decisive proof of consciousness and activity of mind in the prophets when receiving the Divine message. The mind of Jeremiah, so far from being overpowered by the divine communication made to him, here reasons with God on the subject, and, moreover, argues against his being a proper messenger *on account of the feebleness of his mind*, which would have been no reason had the mind had no part in conveying the message. And then, again, the divine reply shows, that he is not to be used merely as a passive instrument, for it exhorts him to faithfulness in delivering the message, and adds motives that may tend to that end.

Again, at another time, when the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, the prophet makes a reply to the communication that at once shows that he fully understood it, for he objects to it, that it is quite contrary to what the self-

commissioned prophets were then preaching to his countrymen. (See Jer. xiv. 13, 14.) Moreover, he is commanded by God to write the prophecies he *had* received in a book; the commission runs in these words,—"The word that came to Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Thus speaketh the Lord God of Israel, saying, Write thee all the words that I *have* spoken unto thee in a book;"—and again, "Take thee a roll of a book, and write therein all the words that I *have* spoken unto thee against Israel," &c. And when Baruch the scribe writes them from his mouth, it is said that he "wrote from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the Lord which he *had* spoken unto him." (See Jer. xxx. 1, 2; and xxxvi. 2, 4.) These prophecies therefore were delivered to Jeremiah some time before he thus repeats them to his scribe; to whom he delivers them, not under the impulse of their announcement to him, but evidently from recollection, giving, in conformity with the Divine command, a faithful report of what had been delivered to him by God. The same knowledge of the meaning of the prophecies he delivered is also clearly displayed by him *in the delivery* of a prophetic message to Zedekiah. (See Jer. xxxviii. 17—27.)

We have evidence equally strong on this point respecting Ezekiel. When he is first commissioned by God as his prophet, he is addressed in these words; "Son of man, all my words that I shall speak *unto thee receive in thine heart*, and hear with thine ears, and go . . . . . and tell them," &c. (Ezek. iii. 10, 11.) There is no meaning in words, if this does not imply that he was first to receive the prophecy into his own understanding, and apply his *mind* to receive and retain it IN ORDER THAT he might be fitted to convey it to others. Such an exhortation, therefore, coming from God, not only proves the point in question, but that it is the duty of the prophet to receive the word of prophecy into his understanding, before he attempts to teach it to others. Another proof of his knowledge of the meaning of the prophetic message, when re-

ceiving it, occurs in another part of his prophecy. (See Ezek. iv. 13, 14.)

In the book of Amos, again, we have the strongest testimony to this point, with respect to the prophets generally, for he says, "*Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.*" (Amos iii. 7.)

The last testimony I shall quote is that which we have in the book of Jonah. When the prophetic message against Nineveh was first delivered to him, with the command to go there and announce it, he fled from the presence of the Lord in another direction. When the command came the second time he is induced to go and deliver it; and upon the repentance of the inhabitants of the city, God deferred his threatened judgments. At this Jonah is much displeased, and he says in anger to God, "Was not this my saying when I was yet in my country? Therefore I fled before unto Tarshish, for I knew that thou art a gracious God . . . and repentest thee of the evil." (See Jonah i. 1—3; iii. 1—3, 10; iv. 2.) The latter passage proves both that the prophetic message was delivered to Jonah when he first received the command to go to Nineveh, and that it was fully understood by him at the time of its first announcement.

The case of the New Testament prophets was precisely the same. Take as an instance the important prophecy of St. Paul, recorded in the second chapter of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians. Who can suppose, on reading that chapter, but that there was the most perfect consciousness and understanding of the general meaning of that prophecy in the mind of St. Paul, when he wrote or dictated it? Indeed he there reminds the Thessalonians, (ver. 5,) that he had before told them the prophecy, speaking of it as a thing with which he was by divine revelation well acquainted.

The careful and impartial reader of the prophetical writings will no doubt find many other passages of a simi-

lar import, but the above seem to the writer amply sufficient to establish the point in question.

It is also not unimportant to observe, in connexion with this subject, the language in which our Lord speaks to his apostles as to those influences of the Holy Spirit, they should receive after his ascension. He says, "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost . . . . will teach you all things." (John xiv. 26.) "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." (John xvi. 13.) And one great object of this was, that they, being themselves illuminated by this divine teaching, might be able to teach others. St. Paul tells us, he was taught the gospel which he preached by the revelation of Jesus Christ. (Gal. i. 11, 12) The apostles, therefore, were not made the mere passive organs of the Spirit when delivering the gospel message; why, then, should they be so, when delivering their prophetic messages? In fact, as we have already seen, *the two* are sometimes so connected with each other in their Epistles, that it would be absurd to suppose that they were differently acted upon by the Spirit in the delivery of them. There is no reason, indeed, as far as the writer can see, to suppose that the description quoted above from our Lord's own words, of the mode in which the Spirit's influences should act upon the apostles, applies more to the ordinary than to the extraordinary operations of the Spirit. These, and such like, were the only promises made by our Lord respecting the spiritual influences he would pour out upon his Church, and hence are surely to be regarded as referring as much to the gifts that qualified them for their prophetic announcements, as to those that enabled them to deliver the gospel message.

It appears, however, from the passages already quoted, and others similar to them, that the prophetic *visions* and *words* communicated to the prophets were not always given to them in the same way. Sometimes they were revealed to them through the medium of the bodily senses. This appears to have been frequently the case with Moses. Probably also the celebrated promise and prophecy made to

Abraham, (Gen. xxii. 15—18), is another instance of this. Other instances may be found in the cases of Samuel, (1 Sam. iii.), of Elisha and his servant, (2 Kings vi. 16, 17), and of St. Paul in his journey to Damascus, (Acts ix. 3—6). In these and similar cases, then, there can be no doubt as to the mind exercising its powers during the revelation; and what they had themselves heard and seen *that* they *afterwards* testified to others.

Sometimes they were delivered to them without the intervention of the bodily senses. The word of prophecy was often, as it appears, impressed immediately upon the mind. This, it is probable, was the case in some at least of the examples just mentioned of revelation by word. There can be no doubt that this was the mode of revelation of which St. Paul speaks in 1 Cor. xiv. 30, where, giving directions respecting their public assemblies for worship, he says, "Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge. If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace. For ye may all prophesy one by one," &c. (verses 29—31.) The revelation was made to the prophet himself, and, beyond doubt, not by an audible voice from God, but by a secret and immediate communication to the prophet's mind. The prophet is not used by God as a speaking-trumpet, according to the modern notion, but as a rational being capable of receiving certain impressions upon his mind, and communicating them afterwards to others, as we shall endeavour to prove more fully hereafter.

A state of *sleep* was sometimes chosen for this purpose, especially for visions, of which we have examples in Abraham, (Gen. xv. 12—16), in Jacob, (Gen. xxviii. 11—15), and in Jeremiah, (Jer. xxxi. 26); and this state was sometimes natural, as in Jacob; and sometimes supernatural, as in that of Abraham. Of revelations made to man in this state, Eliphaz and Elihu both make mention in the book of Job. (See Job iv. 12, et seq., and xxxiii. 14—16.) This also probably was the state of St. Paul, when he received a vision after his arrival at Damascus; (Acts

ix. 12); but certainly it was received without the intervention of his bodily senses, for he was at that time blind, and yet the Lord says to Ananias, when sending him to restore his sight, that he had "*seen* in a vision a man, named Ananias, coming in and putting his hand on him," &c. The state of the prophet's mind during a revelation of this kind shall be considered under the next case.

At other times these revelations were made during what has been called a state of trance, rapture, or *ecstasy*. What this state was in the Old Testament prophets may be learnt from such passages as Ezek. xliii. 3—7, Dan. x. 8—10, and others that have been quoted above. In the New Testament, besides the rapture of St. John, described in the book of Revelation, we have three such cases mentioned as occurring in the persons of St. Peter and St. Paul, viz. St. Peter's *trance*, as our English translators have rendered the word, recorded in Acts x. 10—17, and xi. 5—10; St. Paul's *trance* in the temple, recorded Acts xxii. 17, and his rapture, related in 2 Cor. xii. 1—4, which latter two passages are supposed by Dr. Benson to refer to the same occasion. The word translated *trance*, which occurs three times in this sense, is literally *ecstasy*.[2] Now as to the precise nature of this state, the following questions have been raised. It has been disputed, whether the soul was ever, on these occasions, separated from the body; what was the state of the mind at such a time; and whether either the soul by itself, or the man himself, was transported to those regions in which the vision or word appeared to be given. The first of these points St. Paul himself professes himself unable to determine in his own case, for he says of himself, on one occasion, when in such a state, "Whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body I cannot tell, God knoweth;" (2 Cor. xii. 2); and therefore it appears to the writer something worse than presumption for any one to attempt to decide the point *now* in those cases that appear similar in the persons of some of the antient prophets. The last point is not one

[2] Εκστασις.

which it is at all necessary to discuss here, but it may be observed that the language of the apostle in the above passage makes it equally impossible to determine this *generally;* for had the apostle been certain that there was no actual transportation of any kind to the place in which his vision appeared to be situated, he would also have been certain that he was in the body, for the separation of the soul from the body could only have taken place for the purpose of such transportation. If, therefore, he was in doubt in his own case, whether his transportation was real or only imaginary, shall we attempt to come to any *general* conclusion on the matter? The writer, from the notices of Scripture on the subject, is led to the conclusion, that the apparent transportation was sometimes real and sometimes imaginary. That real transportation by the power of the Spirit did under some circumstances take place, is evident from the case of Philip, (Acts viii. 39, 40). Our Lord's case (Matt. iv. 5—10) is also worth considering in this connexion, as proving the power of Satan in this respect.

What the state of the mind was at such a time it is important to determine. Now, it is agreed by all that a revelation so made was not communicated through the bodily senses. It must therefore have been made immediately to the mind, and impressions received by the mind corresponding to the revelation, because the matter revealed was to be *afterwards* communicated to others. That the communication of it to others was subsequent will be proved more fully below. It has been disputed, however, whether the revelation was made to the imagination only, or so as *also* to affect and call into exercise the reason and judgment. On this point I refer the reader to the passages already quoted. They fully prove that in this state of ecstasy the understanding was conscious of all that passed, and the reasoning powers able to pass judgment upon it.

I would particularly direct the attention of the reader to the passage quoted from the 10th chapter of Daniel. The overpowering effects of that vision as described in verses 8,

9, were such, that (if I recollect right) the description there given has been adduced in support of the opposite views to those here advanced, and yet in the *first* verse of that chapter it is in words stated that Daniel "understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision." Moreover in St. Paul's rapture, (2 Cor. xii. 1—4,) although he knew not whether his soul was separated from the body, or whether his apparent transportation to another place was real or imaginary, yet he was in no doubt as to the powers of his mind being at the time in exercise upon the objects presented to them by God, to whatever else they were shut; for he tells us that he "heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." (verse 4.)

Whether the mind received the impression of the prophetic vision or word separate from the body, or whether it received that impression independently of the body, without being separated from it, still, in both these cases, its state, if at all altered, must, it seems but reasonable to suppose, have been one of *greater*, rather than of *less* power than before. And this applies as much to the state of sleep as to that of rapture or ecstasy.[3]

[3] It is observable that the *trance* of Balaam is expressed by the Septuagint translator of Numbers, by the word (*ὕπνος*) *sleep*. It is evident, whether the translation is correct or not, that the translator considered it to be a state in which the senses were closed to external objects, while it is clear from the narrative, that the mind was awake to the impressions made upon it by God. "For the difference of these two, a *dream* and a *vision*, (says a learned writer,) it seems rather to lie in circumstantials than in any thing essential. . . . . Yet the Jews are wont to make a *vision* superior to a *dream*, as representing things more to the life; which indeed seizeth upon the prophet while he is awake, but it no sooner surpriseth him, but that all his external senses are bound; and so it often declines into a *true dream*, as Maimon., in the place forenamed, proves by the example of Abraham, (Gen. xv. 12,) where the *vision* in which God had appeared to him (as it is related, ver. 1,) passed into a sleep."——"The proper character of those [dreams] that were *prophetical*, he [Philo] clearly insinuates to be that celestial rapture whereby in all prophetical dreams, some more potent cause, acting upon the *mind and imagination* of the prophets, snatched them from themselves, and so left more potent and evident impressions upon them." (J. Smith's Select Discourses. Ed. 1660, pp. 181, 182, and 185, 186.) That the powers of the mind may, *without any supernatural influence upon it*, be in exercise during sleep, every man has probabl had evidence in his own person, and those best able to

Upon the whole, then, the writer is led to the conclusion, that a state of ecstasy was one in which revelations were made to the mind of the prophet so as to affect and call into exercise all its powers, while a bodily insensibility was superinduced either by the power of God, in order to fix the mind more intently on the objects presented to it, or by the operation of those objects effecting from their nature an intense and *exclusive* contemplation of themselves, so as to abstract the mind from all other objects. In the latter case, that insensibility would not be owing to a *real* suspension of the senses, but only to a voluntary abstinence from the *use* of them by the mind, from its being wholly absorbed in the contemplation of the objects then presented to it by God.

A partial illustration of such a state may be found even in the ordinary Christian. Does not his mind, when drawn out fervently in contemplation or prayer, sometimes become all but insensible to any thing but the images which the particular subject then in his view impresses upon it? Such, then, to a greater extent, was the prophet's state when in a rapture or ecstasy.

It is clear, also, from all the passages that relate to this

judge state it as an undeniable fact. "The understanding itself may be in exercise in man during sleep, either in an irregular and incoherent manner, as in *most* dreams, or in a consequent and regular manner, as it happens in some persons happily organized. . . . . It is because the judgment is sometimes correctly exercised in dreams with regard to future events, that in times of ignorance the gift of divination was attributed to them." (See extracts in Hooper's Medical Dictionary, on the word "sleep.") That the antients fully believed that the mind was sometimes in exercise during sleep might be proved by many examples. I take the following as at hand. It is mentioned by Casaubon. He says that the author of the Life of Pythagoras, of which some fragments are left in Photius's Bibliotheca and Suidas, "tells us, that ἡ ψυχη, κατα ποσον τι του σωματος χωριζομενη . . . εν τε τοις ὑπνοις κατα τους ονειρους, και εν ταις εκστασεσι των νοσων, μαντικη γινεται, &c. that is, *that the soul being for a season* (or, *after a sort,*) *separated* (or, *sequestered*) *from the body, both by dreams in sleep, and by ecstasies that come by diseases, doth become prophetical.*" (Mer. Casaubon's Treatise concerning Enthusiasm, 2nd Ed. 1656, p. 83.) That the divine power, then, is able to make impressions upon the mind in sleep, and call its powers into exercise independently of the body, will hardly, I suppose, be questioned.

state, that (as we shall consider more at large presently) the prophets of Scripture did not utter the revelations made to them in a state of ecstasy while *in* that state, but when it was over related what had passed in it, *i. e.* there was an instrumental intervention of their minds in the conveyance of the message. And this of itself affords a proof of the strongest kind that the powers of the prophet's mind were in full force and exercise during that state.

With respect to human authorities for this opinion as to the active state of the prophet's mind under the spiritual influence, we may first refer to the writings of the early Fathers; and as their sentiments on this point are given at length in their own words in the next chapter, I must remit the reader to that place for them, where he will find that all the received Fathers unanimously and strongly urge it as an indubitable truth. I would particularly point the reader's attention to the extracts from Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Athanasius, Hilary, Basil, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Jerome.

With these sentiments of the early Fathers agree those of the most learned of the Rabbies, whose opinions on this subject are fully given in the learned treatise "Of Prophecy," inserted in the "Select Discourses" of Mr. John Smith; a treatise most worthy of the reader's perusal, and from which a brief extract will merit his attention in this place.

In order, however, to show the general consent of learned men of all ages and parties on this subject, I shall first request the reader's perusal of the following passages from a very valuable treatise on the subject, of the learned Jesuit Del Rio. The sentiments he here expresses, it will be observed, are not given as merely his own, but as those entertained by the principal divines of his church. And if it be recollected that they come from perons who have been noted for not being over-backward in admitting claims to inspiration, however weak, and encouraging the fancies of many visionary enthusiasts, they will carry with them the greater weight.

After enumerating the various senses of the word *prophet* in Scripture, he says it also signifies "one who announces to men the hidden secrets of God received by divine revelation. We are now speaking only of this last kind."—"Of this illumination or inspiration divines lay down two kinds, the imaginary and the intellectual. They call one kind imaginary or sensible, *not because it does not belong to the intellect, for such would be improperly called prophetic inspiration*, but because it is imparted first by a representation of things to the senses or the imagination, from which the conception of the mind arises, and with which it is commensurate. They call that the intellectual which does not derive its origin from the senses or the imagination, but arises immediately from light infused into the intellect, and ideas either then first imparted, or existing there before, but made use of by divine power to form a certain natural conception of the mind. And this elevation of the mind happens in two ways. First, when the intellect is so raised in power as to receive impressions independently of the fancy, which is but rarely and by special privilege granted. Secondly, when the fancy co-operates with the apprehension, the intellect not being first moved by the fancy, but the fancy itself being moved and made use of by the intellect, so as to co-operate with it."—"A vision . . . is a prophecy where the mind perceives with the spiritual eye the prophetic object represented to it by the heavenly light . . . . . A [prophetic] word . . . . is a prophecy in which the Holy Spirit teaches the prophet hidden things by a sort of mental converse . . . . . These two kinds of prophecy, viz. those by vision and by word, were sometimes attended with rapture or ecstasy, sometimes unaccompanied with it. They were together in St. Paul's rapture to the third heaven, when he saw and heard what it is not lawful for a man to utter. Perhaps also the vision of Ezekiel was something of this kind, (Ezek. i. 3, and viii. 1—3.) . . . . When, therefore, ecstasy takes place, then the doctrine of the Fathers is to be held, that the prophets were not so affected in mind, or stupified, as

not to understand well what they were predicting. Polychronius (on Ezek. iii.) says, 'As diviners and charmers proceed even to madness, the evil spirit begetting a stupor in them, so on the contrary with the prophets the understanding is moved while the soul is illuminated by the power of the Spirit.' For this was peculiar to the fanatics, such as were the heretical Montanists, and the Gentile soothsayers, as Theophylact thought he collected from St. Paul. (Comm. on 1 Cor. xii. 1.) The author of the treatise *Concerning the Spirit and the Soul*, (which is extant in Augustine's works,) is very undeservedly blamed by Olivarius, for having written that St. John wrote the Apocalypse in ecstasy. For there are two kinds of ecstasy, one divine, the other diabolical . . . . . Therefore that author did not use the word ecstasy to signify a stupefaction of the mind, and an impotency of soul, such as there was in those false prophets, but, like the Fathers, and correctly, to mean a state of rapture or abstraction only from earthly things, and from the use of the bodily senses. *Nor did he mean that the evangelist wrote while in that state*, but that he afterwards put into writing those things which he had seen while he was in that state of ecstasy. Not to mention St. Paul's rapture, such without doubt was that of St. John . . . . . The affection of mind of persons in an ecstasy is called stupor, [catoche,] because such a one is for a time deprived, as it were, of the bodily senses, whence also a certain disease is so called which takes away the sense and motion of the body, which is also called catalepsy. Our medical men call it congelation. I suppose this to be meant when the prophets say, *that the hand of the Lord came upon them;* (2 Kings iii. 15;) also, *the Spirit lifted me up*, or, *the hand of the Lord carried me out in the Spirit;* (Ezek. xi. 1, and xxxvii. 1;) also, *a stupor fell upon him*, where the Greek is, εκστασις, [ecstasy.] (Acts x. 10.)" He then adds that there was also a third kind, viz. a dream, "in which, however," he says, "those only were *prophets* who *understood the meaning of the dream;* as Joseph was a prophet, and not

Pharaoh; Daniel was a prophet, and not Nebuchadnezzar."[4]

[4] "Pro eo qui occulta Dei arcana, per Divinam revelationem accepta, hominibus enunciat. Nos nunc de hac ultima specie tantum loquimur . . . . . Illuminationis seu inspirationis hujus duas ponunt theologi species, imaginariam et intellectualem. Imaginariam sive sensibilem vocant, non quia non pertingat ad intellectum, (talis enim improprie vocaretur prophetica inspiratio,) sed quia primario fit per sensibilem sive imaginariam repræsentationem, ex quâ mentis conceptio nascitur, eique quasi commensuratur. Intellectualem appellant eam, quæ non ducit originem a sensu vel imaginatione, sed oritur immediate per lumen infusum intellectui et per species intellectuales de novo inditas, vel præexistentes, sed Divina virtute ad naturalem aliquam mentis conceptionem formandam applicatas. Quæ elevatio dupliciter contingit. Primò, quando intellectus sic elevatur, ut sine operatione phantasiæ cognoscat; quod rarò ex speciali privilegio conceditur. Secundò, quando phantasia intellectioni cooperatur, non quidem intellectu primum a phantasia moto, sed phantasia ipsa mota et applicata ab intellectu ut secum operetur et concurrat."—"Visio . . . est prophetia, quâ mens spirituali oculo cernit objectum propheticum ipsi cælesti lumine repræsentatum . . . Verbum . . . est prophetia, quâ Spiritus Sanctus mentali quadam locutione prophetam occulta docet . . . Hæ duæ species, visio et verbum, aliquando junctæ sunt cum raptu seu ecstasi, aliquando separatæ. Simul fuere in raptu B. Pauli ad tertium usque cœlum; ubi vidit et audivit quæ non licet homini loqui; fortassis etiam Ezechielis visio quædam talis fuit (Ezech. i. 3, and viii. 1, 3.) . . . . . Quando igitur ecstasis accedit, tunc tenenda Patrum doctrina; prophetas non fuisse sic mente captos vel attonitos ut non probe scirent quid prædicerent. Polychronius, (in Ezech. iii.), *quemadmodum divini et incantatores ad dementiam usque procedunt, dæmone stuporem illis ingenerante; ita e contrario prophetis sensus afficitur, dum anima Spiritus efficacia collustratur:* hoc enim proprium fuit fanaticorum, quales erant hæretici Montanistæ et vates Gentilium, ut ex B. Paulo sibi visus colligere Theophylactus. (Comm. in 1 Cor. xii. 1.) Immeritò valdè ab Olivario reprehenditur auctor *De spiritu et anima* (extat inter opera Augustini), quod scripserit, B. Johannem in ecstasi Apocalypsim scripsisse. Nam ecstasis duplex est, una Divina, alia diabolica . . . . Non igitur auctor ille ecstasim sumpsit pro mentis attonitæ abalienatione et animi quâdam impotentiâ, qualis erat in pseudoprophetis illis, sed, more Patrum et recto, pro raptu, sive pro abstractione tantum a terrenis et sensuum corporeorum functione: nec voluit sic constitutum evangelistam scripsisse, sed quæ, dum in tali ecstasi constitutus, viderat, ea postmodum in scriptum redegisse. Ut mittam S. Pauli raptum, talis haud dubie S. Johannis fuit . . . . Affectio animi ecstaticorum κατοχη vocata, quia sensibus corporeis ad tempus quasi privatur: unde et morbus quidam ita nominatus qui corporis sensu motuque privat, qui et καταληψις. Nostri medici congelationem appellant. Idem significari puto quando prophetæ dicunt, *factam super se manum Domini;* (4 Reg. iii. v. 11 [15]); item, *elevavit me Spiritus,* aut, *eduxit me manus Domini in Spiritu;* (Ezech. xi. 1, et c. xxxvii. 1); item, *cecidit super eum mentis excessus,* ubi Græcè est εκστασις. (Act. x. 10.)" Del Rio, Disquisit. Magic.

The sentiments of the Protestant church cannot be better given than in the following extracts from the able discourse, just alluded to, of Mr. Smith.[5]

"Positive truth can only be made known to us by a free influx of the Divine mind upon our minds and understandings . . . . Yet the souls of men are as capable of conversing with it, though it do not naturally arise out of the fecundity of their own understandings, as they are with any sensible and external objects. And as our sensations carry the notions of material things to our understandings which before were unacquainted with them, so there is some analogical way whereby the knowledge of divine truth may also be revealed to us . . . . And this way of communicating truth to the souls of men, is originally nothing else but prophetical or enthusiastical." (pp. 170, 1.) "The prophetical spirit did not always manifest itself . . . with the same clearness and evidence, in the same exaltation of its light . . . . We shall first of all inquire into the nature of that [inspiration] which is peculiarly amongst the Jews called prophetical. And this is thus defined to us by Maimonides in Par. 2, c. xxxvi. of his *More Nevochim* . . . *The true essence of prophecy is nothing else but an influence from the Deity upon the rational, first, and afterwards the imaginative, faculty, by the mediation of the active intellect* . . . . . But *Rabbi Joseph Albo* in *Maam* 3, c. viii. *De fundamentis fidei*, hath given us a more large description, so as to take in also the *gradus Mosaicus* [the degree of Divine inspiration enjoyed by Moses] . . . *Prophecy is an influence from God upon the rational faculty, either by the mediation of the fancy or otherwise; and this influence, whether by the ministry of an angel or otherwise, makes a man to know such things as by his natural abilities he could not attain to the knowledge of* . . . . . *R. Albo*, in the book before cited, and tenth chapter, hath distinguished prophecy into these four de-

Ed. Lugd. 1612, fol. pp. 214–21. Lib. 4. c. i. *De Divina Prænotione seu Prophetia.*

[5] John Smith's Select Discourses. Lond. 1660, 4to, frequently reprinted.

grees. The first and lowest of all is when the imaginative power is most predominant. . . . . The second . . . is when the strength of the imaginative and rational powers equally balance one another. The third is when the rational power is most predominant . . . . The last and highest is the *gradus Mosaicus*, in which all imagination ceaseth, and the representation of truth descends not so low as the imaginative part, but is made in the highest stage of reason and understanding." (pp. 176—180.) "They supposed the imaginative power to be set forth as a stage upon which certain *visa* [scenes] and *simulacra* [images] were represented to their understandings, just indeed as they are to us in our common dreams; only that *the understandings of the prophets were always kept awake, and strongly acted by God in the midst of these apparitions.*" (pp. 178, 9.) "From what we have formerly discoursed concerning the *stage* of *fancy* and *imagination* upon which those *visa* presented themselves to the mind of the prophet, in which he beheld the real objects of divine truth in which he was inspired by this means; it may be easily apprehended how easy a matter it might be for the devil's prophets many times, by an apish imitation, to counterfeit the true prophets of God, and how sometimes melancholy and turgent fancies, fortified with a strong power of divination, might unfold themselves in a semblance of true enthusiasms. For, indeed, herein the prophetical influx seems to agree with a mistaken enthusiasm, that both of them make strong impressions upon the imaginative powers, and require the imaginative faculty to be vigorous and potent." (pp. 190, 1.) Proceeding then to discuss more fully the difference between the two, he adds, —"From what hath been said ariseth *one main characteristical distinction* between the prophetical and pseudo-prophetical spirit, viz. that the prophetical spirit doth *never alienate the mind*, (seeing it seats itself as well in the *rational* powers as in the *sensitive*,) but always maintains a *consistency and clearness of reason, strength and solidity of judgment*, where it comes; it doth not *ravish the mind*, but *inform and enlighten it.* But the pseudo-prophetical

spirit, if indeed without any kind of dissimulation it enters into any one, because it can rise no higher than the middle region of man, which is his fancy, it there dwells as in storms and tempests, and being αλογον τι [a thing devoid of reason] in itself, is also conjoined with alienations and abreptions of mind . . . This was cautelously observed by the primitive Fathers, who *hereby detected the impostures of the Montanists, that pretended much to prophecy, but indeed were acquainted with nothing more of it than ecstasies or abreptions of mind; for that is it which they mean by ecstasies.*" (pp. 197, 8.) And then, in explanation of such passages as Dan. x. 8, he adds,—" Here we must not mistake the business as if there were nothing but the most absolute clearness and serenity of thoughts lodging in the soul of the prophet amidst all his visions . . . By how much stronger and more vehement those impressions were which were made by those unwonted *visa* which came in to act upon their imaginative faculty, by so much the greater was this perturbation and trouble; and by how much the more the prophet's imagination was exercised by the laboriousness of these phantasms, the more were his natural strength and spirits exhausted, as indeed it must needs be. Therefore Daniel . . . x. 8, complains, &c.. . . . So Gen. xv. 12." (pp. 199, 200.)

In the last place, it is to be observed, that not only was there a perfect consciousness in the prophets of the general meaning of the prophecies they uttered, with a capability of exercising their reasoning faculties upon them, and no constraining influence on their bodily organs, but an *instrumental intervention of their minds in the conveyance of the divine message; i. e.* the vision or word was *first* impressed upon their own minds, and then *afterwards* delivered by them to those to whom they were sent. The intervening time between the reception of the message in the understanding and its delivery might be long or short; it might consist of days, hours, or only seconds; but still it was received, first, into the understanding of the prophet, and *thence* delivered to others. This point has necessarily

been in some degree anticipated on the last head, and I would beg the reader to bear in mind *the proofs of it already given*, while we now proceed to add to them.

Let us observe the *phraseology* of the prophets of Scripture. The modern claimants, with almost all their predecessors in such manifestations, have professed to speak only as the passive organs of the Spirit's utterance; in other words, "*the power*" *speaks* in and by them *in such a way that* the prophecy merely, as it were, passes through their *mouth*. Hence such persons almost invariably, and must, if consistent, *always*, speak as if God himself was speaking. Their announcements, therefore, are given not in his name, but as proceeding immediately, through them, from his own mouth: and consequently, their effusions, assuming the *first* person, claim for the speaker the character of God. Hence the language that proceeds from their lips is such as this: "I am the Word, the Spirit, and the Power."[6] "I am the Holy Spirit."[7] "I am the Lord God Almighty, dwelling in man."[8] "I will show myself a merciful God," &c.[9] "If ye, O vessel who speak, refuse to speak the word, ye shall utterly perish."[1] And such language is only the appropriate phraseology of such claimants, and is always *implied* where it is not expressed in what flows from them. But how different is this from the phraseology of the Scripture prophets! They speak as persons delivering a message *previously* delivered to them. This is manifest on the slightest glance over their writings.—Thus Isaiah tells the people, "*In the year that king Uzziah died, I saw* also the Lord sitting upon a throne . . . . I heard the voice of the Lord, and he said, Go and tell this people," &c. (Is. vi. 1, 8, 9.) In the same way do all the prophets deliver their prophecies. They introduce them with words which show that they are themselves speaking and deli-

[6] Maximilla. See Euseb. Eccl. H. ch. 5. § 16, cited below, p. 107.
[7] Montanus. See Syn. Aq.; Cyr. Hieros.; August. &c. cited below, ch. 3.
[8] Montanus. In Epiph. De Hær. xlviii, cited below, ch. 3. p. 109.
[9] Lacy. See his Warnings, part i. p. 50.
[1] Baxter's Narrative, p. 27.

vering what they had been *previously* directed by God to announce. "The word that came *to Jeremiah* from the Lord, saying . . . . . speak unto the men of Judah . . . . and say thou unto them, Thus saith the Lord," &c. (Jer. xi. 1—3.) "The word of the Lord that came *to Jeremiah.*" (xiv. 1.) "The word of the Lord came also *unto me*, saying, &c. . . . . And it shall come to pass when thou shalt show this people all these words, and they shall say unto thee, &c. . . . *then* shalt thou say unto them," &c. (xvi. 1, 10, 11.) "The word which came *unto Jeremiah* from the Lord . . . Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel, Go and speak to Zedekiah . . . and tell him, &c. Then Jeremiah the prophet spake all these words unto Zedekiah." (xxxiv. 2, 6.) "The word that the Lord spake *to Jeremiah.*" (xlvi. 13.) "The word of the Lord came expressly *unto Ezekiel* the priest." (Ezek. i. 3.) "The word of the Lord came *unto me*, saying, Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore *hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me.*" (iii. 16, 17, repeated xxxiii. 7.) "The word of the Lord came *unto me*, saying, Son of man, set thy face toward Jerusalem, and *drop* THY *word* toward the holy places, and *prophesy* against the land of Israel, and say," &c. (xxi. 1, 2.) "The people said unto me, Wilt thou not tell us what these things are to us, that thou doest so? Then I answered them, The word of the Lord CAME *unto me*, saying, Speak unto the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will profane my sanctuary," &c. (xxiv. 19—21.) "The word of the Lord which came *unto Zephaniah.*" (Zeph. i. 1.) "In the second year of Darius came the word of the Lord *unto Zechariah* . . . saying, The Lord hath been sore displeased with your fathers; therefore say thou unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, turn ye unto me, saith the Lord of hosts," &c. (Zech. i. 1—3.) "Then came the word of the Lord of hosts *unto me*, saying, Speak unto all the people of the land and to the priests, saying," &c. (vii. 4, 5.) And so the announcements of the prophet are called by God the pro-

phet's word, as may be seen in the passage just quoted from Ezek. xxi. 1, 2; and also in the following passage of the same prophet, where God says to Ezekiel of his countrymen, "They sit before thee as my people, and they hear THY words, but they will not do them." (Ezek. xxxiii. 31, repeated ver. 32.) The case of Balaam also, as recorded in Numb. xxii. xxiii. xxiv., affords another clear proof of the point in question. (See particularly Numb. xxii. 35, xxiii. 5, 16, 17, xxiv. 4, 16.)

In the New Testament also, 1 Cor. xiv. 29—31 clearly proves that the revelation was made, in the first instance, to the prophet's own mind. It appears to me to prove this, as it stands in the English version; but the original certainly proves it, for the expression in ver. 30 is literally, "If any thing HATH BEEN REVEALED[2] to another that sitteth by," &c. So St. Peter communicates his vision to the apostles for the instruction of the Church some time after he received it. (Acts x. 9—16, with xi. 1—10.) The language of St. John, also, in the Revelation, clearly proves that he did not write it in the state of rapture, but afterwards, for he says, "I WAS[3] in the isle that is called Patmos," &c. "I WAS[3] in the Spirit," &c. (Rev. i. 9, 10.)

These passages, then, which embrace, be it observed, *all* the different modes of revelation, clearly prove that the prophetic announcements which God chose to make to his people by the prophets were, in the first instance, made to the prophet himself individually, and frequently with the exhortation to him to be a faithful witness to the people of what had been so revealed; in other words, *that the mind of the prophet was an instrument in conveying the message from God to the people.* And in many cases, as for instance in that of Jonah, the revelation was made to the prophet *some time* previous to the delivery of the message by him. That the modern claimants sometimes *imitate* this phraseology is in itself probable, and no doubt a fact. It may, for an obvious reason, be considered by them proper and useful to do so; but this is only a further proof

[2] αποκαλυφθη. [3] εγενομην.

of their inconsistency, as it is irreconcilable with their notions of the mode of the prophetic utterance.

Moreover, it is further observable, in proof of this view of the matter, that there was sometimes *an intervening person between God and the prophet in the conveyance of the message.* The revelation was made first to an angel, by him to the prophet, and then by the prophet to the church. There are, I conceive, several instances of this; but there are two undeniable ones. One in the case of Daniel. His important prophecy of the seventy weeks was given him by the angel Gabriel. (Dan. ix. 21, &s.) Those also that are related in the 11th and 12th chapters were revealed to him by a created angel, who was *sent* to him, and *came* to him *to make him understand* what should befall his people in the latter days. (Dan. x. 11, 14.) The other instance is in the case of St. John, when he wrote the Revelation. His opening words to that book are these: "The revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave UNTO HIM, *to show unto his servants* things which must shortly come to pass; and *He* sent and signified it by *his angel* unto *his servant John.*" (Rev. i. 1.) Another instance, as it appears to me, may be found in the celebrated vision of Ezekiel. (Ezek. xl. &c.) And another certainly occurs in the person of St. Paul. (Acts xxvii. 23, &s.)

In these cases, then, the revelation was first made by God to the angel, by the angel to the prophet, and by the prophet to the church. Now, (not to notice the phraseology of some of these passages, as proving the point in question,) the understanding either of the angel or the prophet must have been used as an instrument for conveying the message; and if that of the former was used, why not that of the latter also? For if the message loses anything, or is AT ALL ALTERED IN ITS CHARACTER, by being conveyed through the instrumentality of the understanding of a creature, it would be so affected in the case of the angel just as well as in that of the prophet. Indeed, the only advantage an angel could have over a man *in this respect*, in the conveyance of the message, would be from

the superior power of his understanding, which does not affect the present case, because we suppose the understanding of the prophet to be endued with sufficient power and clearness on the subject by God, so as to enable him to deliver the message accurately.

To all this also it may be added, that a very strong argument in support of the opinion that the prophets first received the impression of the prophecies they delivered on their own minds, and *thence* communicated them to others, is *the difference of style* observable in their writings, accordant with the characters of the prophets whose name they bear. This is quite unaccountable on the supposition that they were the passive organs of the Holy Spirit's utterance.

To all the arguments against this conclusion that can be derived from such passages as, "God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets;" (Luke i. 70;) "Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" (2 Pet. i. 21;) "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you;" (Matt. x. 20;) the simple reply is, Did the prophets or apostles speak as if God was speaking *personally* through them as his mere organs of utterance, or did they speak as persons delivering a message which they had received from God? If the latter, these passages must be explained, and can as easily be explained, consistently with that mode of speaking; and these passages will no more prove that they were the passive organs of the Spirit's utterance, than the expression, "This is my body," proves the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Upon this point the Fathers are equally consentient in favour of that view of the subject which is here adopted, as in the two former.

The passage given in a preceding part of this chapter from Epiphanius, very expressly asserts this. "The prophet," he says, "bringing to light the things *previously infused into his understanding by the Holy Spirit*, profits his hearers by his prophecy."[4]

[4] See above, p. 66. And see pp. 131—3, below.

Thus also Origen, in the passages quoted below, says,—"He had the power, after he had received the word of God, to speak or to be silent . . . . . It was in the power of the prophet who heard the command, *Say*, whether he should speak or not."[5]—"Any one who has the spirit of prophecy . . . speaks when he pleases and reason requires."[6] And again, expressly,—"The prophets among the Jews, being *enlightened* by the Divine Spirit, as far as it was beneficial to the prophets themselves, received BEFOREHAND the influx of the superior power within themselves."[7]

So also Hilary of Poictiers tells us, that "the divine precepts are not so inconsistent with equity that it should be unbefitting the divine character to enable the prophet first to understand them, that they may by his preaching become clear to public apprehension."[8]

So Basil says, that the prophet delivered his prophecy "*as imprinted upon his mind*," and that in a prophet "*God acts upon the understanding itself*, &c."[9]

So Jerome says, that "God spoke in the mind of the prophets."[1] And in fact the same view is *implied* in almost all the passages quoted in the next chapter, respecting the Montanists. And the same may be said of those from Del Rio, and Mr. Smith, quoted above. The former, indeed, asserts it in terms.

And hence the Fathers accused Montanus as *a blasphemer*, when he allowed such words to escape his lips, as, "I am the Holy Ghost," which is the strongest possible proof that they did not hold the notion that the Spirit spoke personally through the organs of men; for, as we have already observed, the language is unobjectionable, and, in fact, appropriate and necessary in that case; and their opposition to this language in him was not on the ground of his personal unfitness to use it, but of its being language unfit to escape the lips of any man.

We have, then, the strongest possible evidence, that the

[5] P. 122, below. [6] P. 124, below. [7] P. 124, below.
[8] P. 128, below. [9] P. 130, below. [1] P. 140, below.

true prophets always spoke as perfectly free agents, without any the least constraint upon their bodily organs, and with a full consciousness of the general meaning of what they said, and that *their minds were used as instruments for the conveyance of the divine message*, the revelation being *first* impressed upon the mind of the prophet by God, and thence delivered by the prophet to others.

Now the mode of revelation to the scriptural prophets which is most, though indeed little enough, like that pretended to by our modern claimants, and most of their predecessors, is that by a state of ecstasy, and this or something similar is the term which they seem generally to apply to it. Contrary, however, to what we have just endeavoured to prove of the prophets of Scripture IN EVERY CASE, they utter their supposed revelations while *in* this state, and suppose that state to be one in which the body is under the constraining influence of a superior power, and the mind "kept in abeyance," denying all *instrumental intervention of the mind in the conveyance of the message*, and, some of them, even the *necessity* of consciousness of the meaning of what they utter. The error is one of very early date, for it appeared in the Montanists at the latter part of the second century. Hence some of those who wrote against them accused them of speaking in an *immoderate* ecstasy.[2] But as *most* of the early Fathers did not observe this distinction, *and, taking the word in the meaning which the Montanists had affixed to it*, argued that a state of ecstasy was indicative of a false prophet, the word ecstasy has since been, perhaps generally, used in that sense; and this usage has thus not only produced some confusion on the subject, but has not unfrequently given an opportunity to claimants of the Montanist character to refer to Scripture, as if it supported their pretensions.

It may be well to notice here, before I conclude this

[2] Εν παρεκστασει. Thus writes the contemporary author, probably Asterius Urbanus, quoted by Eusebius. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 16. It may also be observed that the Septuagint translator of Hosea has applied the term, παρεξιστημι, to a false prophet, in his translation of Hos. ix. 7.

chapter, a curious argument on this subject, made use of by the Editor of "The General Delusion of Christians," &c. in one of his notes to that work, (p. 284,) tending, if true, to prove that the external circumstances that attend the delivery of false prophecies, must be the same as attended the delivery of the true. He says, "The false spirits must simulate every action of the Holy Spirit, or they would be easily discovered, and would not be so subtle as to deceive all but 'the very elect.'... *Any immaterial fact being ascertained to be an invariable concomitant of a false spirit, proves thereby the same concomitant of the true.* . . . The Pythonesses, as well as those called false by the Fathers, from being in ecstasy, would not have had violent agitations, unless there were similar accompaniments i those possessed of the Holy Spirit." This is surely a very strange argument. It is equivalent to the making Satan's imitations of the works of God our standard of judgment as to the nature of those works. When Satan appeared to our first parents in Paradise, under the form of a serpent, did that prove that a good spirit must have appeared to them before in that shape? But still further; it rests upon a false assumption. It takes for granted that the form of the manifestation of the divine influence upon the prophets is *universally* known and agreed upon, for otherwise there is no universally-acknowledged standard by which to judge of the imitation. This, however, is disputed; and therefore the deceit of Satan, even when he fails in a correct imitation of the characteristics of the manifestation of the Spirit in the prophets, is not "easily discovered," because he can also, when permitted, delude the minds of men as to the nature of those manifestations.

CHAPTER III.

THE CASE OF THE MONTANISTS.

In an inquiry like the present, it is important to take into account *the past experience* of the Christian Church, and ascertain whether there have been in her history any similar cases to the one before us, and, if so, what have been their results, and what the opinions respecting them of the great body of the wise and good of their day.

Now, it so happens, that, among other examples, a case remarkably similar to the one before us occurred at a period when the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were still present with the Church. I proceed, then, to consider first this case, and, as being a very important one, and not much known, at some length; giving in their order the opinions of all the most valuable of the early Christian Fathers, on the characteristics that distinguished it.

The extraordinary gifts of the Spirit appear to have remained with the Church during at least the first two centuries. We are told by Irenæus of Lyons, in a work written by him, according to Cave, in the year 176 or 177, that there were "many in the Church," at the time he wrote, who "possessed prophetic gifts, and spake through the Spirit in all kinds of tongues."[1]

And so, in another part of that work, he asserts that the power of working miracles of healing, and other similar gifts

[1] Καθως και πολλων ακουομεν αδελφων εν τη Εκκλησια, προφητικα χαρισματα εχοντων, και παντοδαπαις λαλουντων δια του Πνευματος γλωσσαις, και τα κρυφια των ανθρωπων εις φανερον αγοντων επι τω συμφεροντι, και τα μυστηρια του Θεου εκδιηγουμενων. Irenæi Adv. Hær. lib. v. c. 6. Ed. Massuet. 1710. p. 299. The passage is preserved by Euseb. Eccl. Hist. b. v. c. 7.

of the Spirit existed at that time in the Church.[2] And this testimony might easily be confirmed by others.[3] The Church, therefore, up to that time at least, was well acquainted with their true nature, and able to estimate correctly the pretensions of those who laid claim to the possession of them. Among these claimants was Montanus, who in the year 172 (according to Eusebius in his Chronicle) supposed himself to have received the prophetic gift.

The account of this matter as given by a CONTEMPORARY AUTHOR[4] and preserved by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, book 5, c. 16, &s. is as follows;—

" This their quarrel, therefore, and the new heresy of these schismatics against the Church, arose in the following way:—There is said to be a village in the Phrygian Mysia called Ardaba. There they say that, first of all, one of the new converts, by name Montanus, when Gratus was pro-consul of Asia, having, through his immoderate desire of pre-eminence, allowed the adversary to enter him, was *possessed by a spirit, and, having been suddenly seized with a sort of rapture and immoderate ecstasy, was violently moved by the spirit, and began to talk and utter unintelligible sounds, uttering prophecies truly in a way that according*

[2] Ibid. lib. ii. cc. 31 and 32, pp. 164 and 166.

[3] Dodwell cites many testimonies from the Fathers, to prove that the prophetic gifts remained with the Church from the time of the apostles to that of Cyprian. See his Dissert. Cyprian. Diss. 4.

[4] Not named by Eusebius. St. Jerome is by some supposed to say, in his accounts of Rhodon and Miltiades, that it was Rhodon, because he asserts that Rhodon mentions the work of Miltiades, (De vir. ill. c. 37 & 39), and the author quoted by Eusebius does this. But it does not therefore follow that they are the same. It has also been said, that St. Jerome, in his Life of Apollonius (c. 40), makes *him* the person; but this rests on no better ground than the last assertion. The intimation parenthetically inserted afterwards in Eusebius, that the author was Asterius Urbanus, is supposed by Valesius to have proceeded either from Eusebius himself, or at least some antient scholiast. The best evidence, therefore, is in favour of *his* being the author; and this is the judgment of Dr. Cave. (Hist. Lit.) At least it appears clear from Eusebius's *whole account* in ch. xvi—xix. taken together and compared, that it was not Apollonius, nor, as some have supposed, Apolinarius. Eusebius (c. 17,) calls him one of the authors who were raised up for the Church *with* Apolinarius, and therefore, at any rate, he was a *contemporary* author.

to tradition and the order that has been handed down to us by succession is quite contrary to the usage of the Church from the beginning. But of those who at that time were within the hearing of his unauthorized exclamations, some being grieved at him, as one that was possessed with a devil, and a demoniac, and in subjection to a spirit of error, and that raised a disturbance in the multitude, rebuked him, and forbad him to speak; remembering the distinction laid down by the Lord, and his warning, to guard with vigilance against the entering in of false prophets. But others, being elated as if they had become possessed of the Holy Spirit and the prophetic gift, and not a little puffed up with pride, and forgetful of the distinction pointed out by the Lord, encouraged that infatuating, and flattering, and seducing spirit, being deceived and led astray by it, so that it was no longer compelled to be silent. And by some contrivance, but more especially by this mischievous device, the devil, having plotted the destruction of the hearers, and being unduly honoured by them, covertly excited and inflamed their mind, which had been estranged from the true faith; so that he stirred up besides certain others, two women namely, and filled them with a counterfeit spirit, so that they spoke in an extravagant and unbefitting and strange way, like the person already mentioned. And *those who delighted, and boasted in this, that spirit pronounced blessed,* and puffed them up with the greatness of his professions, and sometimes *in a hypothetical and plausible way he openly rebuked them, that he might also seem a reproving spirit. But these Phrygians that were deceived were few in number. And this arrogant spirit taught them to revile the whole and every particular church under heaven, because this spirit of false prophecy received no honour or countenance from it.* For the faithful in Asia having *frequently and in many parts of Asia* met upon this subject, and having investigated this new doctrine, and adjudged it profane, and condemned the heresy, they were thus expelled the church and excommunicated."

"And again [adds Eusebius] he says, in the same trea-

tise, that the holy bishops of that time endeavoured to rebuke the spirit that was in Maximilla, but that they were hindered by others; by those, that is, that favoured that spirit. And he writes thus: 'And let not THE SPIRIT THAT SPEAKS THROUGH MAXIMILLA SAY,' (it occurs in the same treatise of Asterius Urbanus,) 'I am driven as a wolf from the sheep; I am not a wolf; I AM THE WORD, AND THE SPIRIT, AND THE POWER.'"

The same author also, as Eusebius informs us, reproves in that treatise the falsehood of the prophecies of one of those women, particularly some in which she had PREDICTED THAT WARS AND TUMULTS WERE NEAR AT HAND; showing also, by what he says, the time at which he wrote, observing—"And how is it, that this falsehood has not already become apparent and acknowledged? For more than thirteen years have now elapsed since that woman died, and there has neither been a particular nor a general war in the whole world? But, on the contrary, there has been, through the mercy of God, a lasting peace to the Christians."

And in the third book he adds, speaking of their boast of having more martyrs than others,—"When, therefore, they have been refuted in all the points that have been mentioned, and are at a loss, they attempt to fly to their martyrs, and say, that they have many martyrs, and that this is a sure proof of the power of that which is called by them a prophetic spirit. But this truly, as appears to me, is least of all true. For some of the other heresies have very many martyrs, and yet we shall not on that account agree with them, nor confess that they have truth on their side. The first of those who followed the heresy of Marcion, called Marcionists, say that they have very many martyrs of Christ, and yet they do not confess Christ himself in truth .... Whence, also, when those who are called from the Church to martyrdom for the true faith have fallen in with any followers of the Phrygian heresy called martyrs, they express their disagreement with them, and avoid all communion with them while they

are perfected by martyrdom, because they are unwilling to give any countenance to the spirit that speaks through Montanus and his women."

In the same book, a little further on, (according to Eusebius,) he says, after enumerating several of the prophets of the New Testament;—"But the false prophet [speaks] in an immoderate ecstasy, which is attended by shamelessness and effrontery, arising out of a voluntary ignorance, and terminating in an involuntary madness, as has been already said. But they will not be able to show any prophet, either under the Old or New Testament, who was inspired in this way." [5]

[5] Ἡ τοινυν ενστασις αυτων και ἡ προσφατος του αποσχισματος ἁιρεσις προς την Εκκλησιαν την αιτιαν εσχε τοιαυτην. Κωμη τις ειναι λεγεται εν τη κατα την Φρυγιαν Μυσιᾳ, καλουμενη Ardaβau τουνομα· ενθα φασι τινα των νεοπιστων πρωτως, Μοντανον τουνομα, κατα Γρατον Ασιας ανθυπατον, εν επιθυμια ψυχης ἀμετρω φιλοπρωτειας δοντα παροδον εις ἑαυτον τω αντικειμενω, πνευματοφορηθηναι τε και αιφνιδιως εν κατοχῃ τινι και παρεκστασει γενομενον ενθουσιᾶν· ἀρξασθαι τε λαλειν και ξενοφωνειν, παρα το κατα παραδοσιν και κατα διαδοχην ανωθεν της Εκκλησιας εθος δηθεν προφητευοντα. Των δε κατ' εκεινο καιρου εν τη των νοθων εκφωνηματων ακροασει γενομενων, οἱ μεν ὡς επι ενεργουμενω και δαιμονωντι και εν πλανης πνευματι ὑπαρχοντι, και τους οχλους ταραττοντι αχθομενοι επετιμων, και λαλειν εκωλυον· μεμνημενοι της του Κυριου διαστολης τε και απειλης, προς το φυλαττεσθαι την των ψευδοπροφητων εγρηγοροτως παρουσιαν· οἱ δε ὡς ἁγιω πνευματι και προφητικω χαρισματι επαιρομενοι, και ουχ ἥκιστα χαυνουμενοι, και της διαστολης του Κυριου επιλανθανομενοι, το βλαψιφρον και ὑποκοριστικον και λαοπλανον πνευμα προυκαλουντο, θελγομενοι και πλανωμενοι ὑπ' αυτου, εις το μηκετι κωλυεσθαι σιωπαν. Τεχνη δε τινι, μαλλον δε τοιαυτη μεθοδω κακοτεχνιας, ὁ Διαβολος την κατα των παρηκοων απωλειαν μηχανησαμενος, και παρ' αξιαν ὑπ' αυτων τιμωμενος, ὑπεξηγειρε τε και προσεξεκαυσεν αυτων την αποκεκοιμημενην απο κατ' αληθειαν πιστεως διανοιαν, ὡς και ἑτερας τινας δυο γυναικας επεγειραι, και του νοθου πνευματος πληρωσαι, ὡς και λαλειν εκφρονως και ακαιρως και αλλοτριστροπως ὁμοιως τω προειρημενω. Και τους μεν χαιροντας και καυχωμενους επ' αυτω μακαριζοντος του πνευματος, και δια του μεγεθους των επαγγελματων εκφυσιουντος. Εσθ' ὁτε δε και κατακρινοντος στοχαστικως και αξιοπιστως αυτους αντικρυς, ἱνα και ελεγκτικον ειναι δοκῃ. Ολιγοι δ' ησαν ὁυτοι των Φρυγων εξηπατημενοι. Την δε καθολου και πασαν την ὑπο τον ουρανον εκκλησιαν βλασφημειν διδασκοντος του απηυθαδισμενου πνευματος, ὁτι μητε τιμην μητε παροδον εις αυτην το ψευδοπροφητικον ελαμβανε πνευμα. Των γαρ κατα την Ασιαν πιστων πολλακις και πολλαχῃ της Ασιας εις τουτο συνελθοντων, και τους προσφατους λογους εξετασαντων, και βεβηλους αποφηναντων, και αποδοκιμασαντων την ἁιρεσιν, ὁυτω δη της τε εκκλησιας εξεωσθησαν και της κοινωνιας

Further information respecting Montanus and his party may be derived from Epiphanius's account of the heresy, (to which we shall have occasion to refer presently), especially as to their *mode of speaking*, in which he confirms the testimony, given above, of their speaking as if God was speaking in them, and thus assuming *in their utterances* the person of God. Thus he objects to Montanus, as a proof of his being a false prophet, that he spoke in this style,—"I am the Lord God Almighty dwelling in man;"[6] "I am neither an angel nor ambassador, but I the Lord God the Father am present."[7]

ειρχθησαν.—Αυθις δε εν τω αυτω φησι λογω, τους τοτε ἱερους επισκοπους πεπειρᾶσθαι μεν το εν τη Μαξιμιλλη πνευμα διελεγξαι· κεκωλυσθαι δε προς ἑτερων, συνεργουντων δηλαδη τω πνευματι. Γραφει δε ὁυτως. Και μη λεγετω (εν τω αυτω λογω τω κατα Αστεριον Ουρβανον)* το δια Μαξιμιλλης πνευμα, Διωκομαι ὡς λυκος εκ προβατων· ουκ ειμι λυκος· Ῥημα ειμι και Πνευμα και Δυναμις. —Και πως ου καταφανες ηδη γεγονε και τουτο το ψευδος; πλειω γαρ η τρισκαιδεκα ετη εις ταυτην την ἡμεραν εξ ὁυ τετελευτηκεν ἡ γυνη, και ουτε μερικος ουτε καθολικος κοσμω γεγονε πολεμος. Αλλα και Χριστιανοις μαλλον ειρηνη διαμονος εξ ελεους Θεου.—Ὁταν τοινυν εν πασι τοις ειρημενοις ελεγχθεντες απορησωσιν, επι τους μαρτυρας καταφευγειν πειρωνται, λεγοντες πολλους εχειν μαρτυρας, και τουτο ειναι τεκμηριον πιστον της δυναμεως του παρ' αυτοις λεγομενου προφητικου πνευματος. Το δ' εστιν αρα ὡς εοικε παντος μαλλον ουκ αληθες. Και γαρ των αλλων ἁιρεσεων τινες πλειστους ὁσους εχουσι μαρτυρας, και ου παρα τουτο δηπου συγκαταθησομεθα, ουδε αληθειαν εχειν αυτους ὁμολογησομεν. Και πρωτοι γε ὁι απο του Μαρκιωνος ἁιρεσεως, Μαρκιωνισται καλουμενοι, πλειστους ὁσους εχειν Χριστου μαρτυρας λεγουσιν, αλλα τον γε Χριστον αυτον κατ' αληθειαν ουχ ὁμολογουσι. . . . . Ὁθεν τοι και επειδαν ὁι επι το της κατ' αληθειαν πιστεως μαρτυριον κληθεντες απο της Εκκλησιας τυχωσι μετα τινων των απο της των Φρυγων ἁιρεσεως λεγομενων μαρτυρων, διαφερονται τε προς αυτους, και μη κοινωνησαντες αυτοις τελειουνται, δια το μη βουλεσθαι συγκαταθεσθαι τω δια Μοντανου και των γυναικων πνευματι.—Αλλ' ὁγε ψευδοπροφητης εν παρεκστασει, ὡ ἑπεται αδεια και αφοβια· αρχομενος μεν εξ ἑκουσιου αμαθιας, καταστρεφων δε εις ακουσιον μανιαν ψυχης, ὡς προειρηται. Τουτον δε τον τροπον, ουτε τινα των κατα την Παλαιαν ουτε των κατα την Καινην πνευματοφορηθεντα προφητην δειξαι δυνησονται.—Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 16. Ed. Reading. Cant. 1720.

[6] Ετι δε προστιθησιν ὁ αυτος Μοντανος, ὁυτω λεγων. Εγω Κυριος ὁ Θεος ὁ παντοκρατωρ καταγινομενος εν ανθρωπω.—Epiphan. De hæres. xlviii. 11. Ed. Paris. 1622. vol. i. p. 412.

[7] Ειτα παλιν φησι το ελεεινον ανθρωπαριον Μοντανος, ὁτι, Ουτε αγγελος, ουτε πρεσβυς, αλλα εγω Κυριος ὁ Θεος Πατηρ ηλθον. Ib. p. 413.

* These words Valesius considers to have been a marginal annotation, either of Eusebius himself or some antient scholiast.

And hence the Fathers, with very good reason, taking Montanus as the real utterer of what proceeded out of his mouth, asserted that he *called himself* the Holy Spirit. This is said of him by, among others, a synod of Thracian bishops, whose president was Sotas, bishop of Anchialus, convened about the year 180,[8] Cyril of Jerusalem,[9] Theodorit,[1] and Augustine.[2] And so Epiphanius, after giving the language of Montanus just quoted, speaks of him as one who *said that he was* the Almighty Father.[3]

Not, indeed, that they supposed that he identified himself with God the Father or the Holy Spirit, as is clear from other passages in these authors, and from their knowing, as they must, that others of his party personated God, or the Holy Spirit, as much as he did, when speaking prophetically, but they justly held him accountable for what proceeded out of his mouth, and looked upon him as the speaker of it. Hence others have not gone further than to assert that the claim of the Montanists was, that the Holy Spirit peculiarly manifested himself in them.[4] And this, certainly, was more like what he himself asserted, as he would, no doubt, have repudiated the claim of being himself the Holy Ghost, though his language justly exposed him to the accusation. Tertullian never calls Montanus or Priscilla absolutely the Holy Spirit or Paraclete, but only alleges that the Paraclete spoke in them. And this

[8] See below, p. 117.

[9] See below, p. 128.

[1] See below, p. 143.

[2] See Aug. De hæres. xxvi.

[3] See below, p. 132.

[4] So Philastrius, "Addunt etiam [*i. e.* Cataphryges] plenitudinem Sancti Spiritus non per apostolos Christo dante fuisse concessam, sed per illos suos pseudo-prophetas [*i. e.* "Montanum, Priscillam, et Maximillam,"] æstimant impartitam." Philastr. de hæres. Hær. sub. apost. 2. Cataphryges. Bibl. Patrum, Col. Agripp. 1618. tom. 4. p. 601. Also the anonymous author of the tract called "Prædestinatus;"—"Hi itaque [*i. e.* Cataphryges] adventum Spiritus Sancti a Domino promissum in se potius quam in apostolis fuisse asserunt redditum." Prædestinatus. Ed. Jac. Sirmond. Paris. 1643. 8vo. And Jerome;—"Aliæ hæreses Paracletum in Montanum venisse contendunt." Hieron. Adv. Vigilant. Ed. Bened. vol. 4. pt. 2. col. 285. "Ad extremum per Spiritum Sanctum in Montanum Priscillam et Maximillam insanas fœminas descendisse [*i. e.* Deum], et plenitudinem quam Paulus non habuerit . . . . . habuisse Montanum." Hieron. Epist. ad Marcell. vol. 4. pt. 2. col. 65.

was the language of the early Montanists on this subject, as we learn from Firmilian. "If," he says, "we ask what Christ they [i. e. the Montanists] preach, they will reply, that they preach him who sent the spirit which *spoke through* Montanus and Priscilla."[5] The same author, also, Epiphanius, who has left us the specimen just quoted, of the language uttered by Montanus, tells us of the Montanists in the same treatise; "Concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, they hold the same doctrines[6] with the holy Catholic Church;"[7] and of Montanus, that his claim was to be considered *a prophet*,— "Montanus, ... who boasts himself to be *a prophet*."[8] From all these passages, then, it is clear, that neither Montanus nor any of his party claimed to be personally the Holy Spirit, while at the same time their language shows that they considered the Holy Spirit to speak personally through them, when prophesying, as his organs of utterance.[9]

From this account, then, we see that as to the *matter* of these prophecies of Montanus and his followers, what they uttered was a mixture of incoherent exclamations and unin-

[5] Epist. ad Cyprian. inter Cypr. Ep. LXXV. [6] Ὁμοίως φρονουσι.

[7] Adv. Hær. in hær. 48. Ed. Par. 1622, p. 402. [8] Ib. p. 411.

[9] Modern authors have raised an unnecessary debate upon the question, whether Montanus called himself the Holy Spirit or not; and, arguing from the circumstances and probabilities of the case, have, in the teeth of most of the primitive Fathers, generally determined that he did not.—(See Du Pin. Eccl. Hist. vol. i. p. 96. Petavii Theol. Dogmat. Ittigii De hæresiarch. sæc. prim. et sec. § 2, c. xiii.) This is, indeed, to a certain extent true, but only so far as respects *his own account of his pretensions*, and thus far is affirmed by the Fathers themselves; whose representations of an apparently contrary nature refer to *his prophetic utterances*, in which he suffered words to proceed out of his mouth such as purported to come *immediately* from God himself. He, like many since, evidently supposed that the Holy Spirit made use of his bodily organs, and during his prophetic utterances was the only agent that moved them. Hence what was uttered was spoken, as the English and French prophets of the last century did, and as our modern claimants have done, *in the person* of God, or the Holy Spirit. Montanus did not, any more than his successors, intend thereby to identify himself with the Holy Spirit; but it was a blasphemous absurdity, springing out of the primary error of supposing himself the mere passive organ of the Holy Spirit's utterance; and his opponents, after witnessing such language proceeding out of his mouth, accused him, not without reason, of calling himself God and the Holy Spirit.

telligible sounds, with words of prophetic admonition or forewarning, in which they delighted to tell of speedily approaching judgments.[1] And as to the *manner*, that the particular characteristic of these Montanist prophets was that they spoke as the passive bodily organs of a superior power, and in what this contemporary author has called an *immoderate* ecstasy, to distinguish it probably from the ecstasy of the Scriptural Prophets. The Montanists themselves, as appears from Tertullian, professed to speak in an ecstasy; and hence most of the subsequent Fathers, taking the word in the Montanist sense, have argued against ecstasy as the sign of a false prophet. The Montanist meaning of the phrase may be gathered from the above narrative, and is abundantly testified by the following extracts, particularly those from Basil, Epiphanius, and Jerome, viz. that it signified their speaking as the *involuntary* and *unconscious* organs of utterance to the spirit by which they were actuated; *and this was so far from being denied by them*, that it is even made by Tertullian (after he became a Montanist) a necessary sign of divine inspira-

[1] These judgments, it appears, they considered *the immediate precursors of the millennium*. "Mosheim asserts (De reb. Christianorum ante Constant. Sec. 2. c. 67,) on the authority of the work already quoted under the title of Prædestinatus, that among his other doctrines Montanus taught the approaching downfall of the Roman empire, which would be followed by the appearance of antichrist and the second coming of our Lord to avenge the persecutions inflicted on his saints."—Bp. Kaye's Eccl. Hist. illustrated from the writings of Tertullian. 2nd edit. pp. 20, 21. It appears also, from a passage of Tertullian (Adv. Marc. III. c. 24.), quoted by Bp. Kaye, and by Lardner in his "History of Heretics," Art. Montanists, that they interpreted the prophecies relating to the millennium *literally*, and supposed "that the heavenly Jerusalem would descend on earth, and that the saints would reign there for a thousand years."—It somehow happened that neither of these learned and valuable works had been consulted by me when the former edition of this work was published, or I should gladly have availed myself of such researches, (which of course contain much that is to be found here,) and acknowledged the obligation. The case however was drawn with care from the original sources of information, which enabled me to develope it more fully in the important points connected with the subjects of this volume than has been done elsewhere. What additional matter I could collect on the subject from the above works is inserted in this note, and those occurring in pp. 147, 148, 150, and 152.

tion, as, among other passages, may be seen particularly by the following;—"We defend the position, that a state of ecstasy, that is, alienation of mind, is suitable to the spiritual gift. For a man who is in the Spirit, especially when he beholds the glory of God, or when God speaks by him, necessarily loses his reasoning faculties for the time, being overwhelmed, that is, by the divine power."[2]

And hence, even in *those* revelations which they professed to have received in visions while in a state of sleep or trance, and *afterwards* delivered to the people, he expressly asserts that their *understanding* was in a state of "*stupor*," and had no impression made upon it by these visions, although forced to the conclusion that the agency of *the memory* was necessary.[3]

Upon *all* these grounds, then, viz. that they delivered their prophecies *during* the state of ecstasy, that they pretended to speak as the mere passive organs of the Holy Spirit's utterance, and thus *personated* God, that they spoke by a superior constraining power acting upon their bodily organs, and that they spoke unconscious of the meaning of what they uttered, and unable to exercise their reasoning faculties upon it—upon all these grounds the primitive Fathers joined issue with them, and have unanimously, i. e. all whom the Church has been accustomed to receive, pronounced condemnation upon their sentiments.

The following extracts will, I think, sufficiently prove this to every unprejudiced mind. They are most of them expressly on the subject of the Montanist prophets, and a few on the general question, as will be seen from the extracts themselves. It must be remembered, that every condemnation of Montanus for saying in his prophetic utterances, "I am God," or, "I am the Holy Spirit," involves

[2] "—— Defendimus . . . gratiæ ecstasin, id est, amentiam convenire. In Spiritu enim homo constitutus, præsertim quum gloriam Dei conspicit, vel quum per ipsum Deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet virtute Divina." Adv. Marc. lib. 4. c. 22. See also lib. 5. c. 8, and his "Liber de anima," c. 9. He also wrote a work in six books on this subject, entitled "De ecstasi," which is lost.

[3] Tertull. De anima, c. xlv.

the condemnation of the general assertion that true prophets speak as the passive organs of the Holy Spirit's utterance.

There is hardly any point upon which the general opinion of the antient Church was more fully, clearly, and strongly expressed than on the pretensions of the Montanist prophets. They were, immediately on their first appearance, proscribed (as we have already seen) by various synods convened in Asia, where these prophets and their followers were condemned and excommunicated;[4] opposed by "most of the celebrated men of the time;"[5] "held in abhorrence by *all* the [Christian] brotherhood in the world."[6]

Of the various authors who wrote against them the first I would mention is,

Apolinarius Bishop of Hierapolis, a. d. 172.

He was one of the most excellent and learned men of the time, as Eusebius, Jerome, Theodorit, and others, bear witness. Of his writings on this subject there are now none extant. Eusebius thus speaks of them: "Against the heresy called the heresy of the Phrygians, therefore, that Power that is the defender of the truth raised up as a powerful and invincible opponent, Apolinarius, bishop of Hierapolis, whom we have before mentioned, and most of the other celebrated men of the time with him."[7] From the writings of one of these, he tells us, the account given above was extracted. And shortly after he says,—"Of the writings of Apolinarius against the heresy we have mentioned, Sarapion makes mention, who, report says, was

[4] See quotation from Eusebius above, p. 107.

[5] Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. book 5. c. xvii. init. See next paragraph.

[6] Sarapion as quoted by Eusebius, ib. c. xix. See next paragraph.

[7] Προς μεν ουν την λεγομενην Κατα Φρυγας αἱρεσιν ὁπλον ισχυρον και ακαταγωνιστον επι της Ἱεραπολεως τον Απολιναριον, ὁν και προσθεν μνημην ὁ λογος πεποιητο, αλλους τε συν αυτω πλειους των τηνικαδε λογιων ανδρων, ἡ της αληθειας ὑπερμαχος ανιστη Δυναμις.—Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. c. 17.

at that time bishop of the church of Antioch, having succeeded to Maximinus. He mentions him in his Epistle to Caricus and Ponticus, in which refuting also himself this heresy, he subjoins these words: 'And that you may see this fact, that the dæmoniacal conduct of this set of impostors, called the new prophecy, is held in abhorrence by all the brotherhood in the world, I have sent you also the letters of that most blessed saint, Claudius Apolinarius, who was bishop of Hierapolis in Asia."[8] In these writings Apolinarius had spoken of them as persons possessed with an evil spirit.[9] Nor did he content himself with merely writing against them himself, but convened

A Synod of twenty-six Bishops at Hierapolis

upon the subject, at which he presided. This was probably one of the synods alluded to by Eusebius in the passage quoted above. Of this in particular, we find the following notice in an antient synodical book: "A divine and sacred provincial synod at Hierapolis in Asia, convened by Apolinarius, the most holy bishop of this place, and twenty-six other bishops, that formally proscribed and excommunicated Montanus and Maximilla, the false prophets."[1]

[8] Των δε Απολιναριου κατα της δηλωθεισης αἱρεσεως μνημην πεποιηται Σαραπιων, ὁν επι των δηλουμενων χρονων μετα Μαξιμινον επισκοπον της Αντιοχεων εκκλησιας κατεχει λογος γενεσθαι. Μεμνηται δε αυτου εν ιδια επιστολη τη προς Καρικον και Ποντικον, εν ἡ διευθυνων και αυτος την αυτην αἱρεσιν επιλεγει ταυτα. Ὁπως δε και τουτο ιδητε, ὁτι της ψευδους ταυτης ταξεως της επικαλουμενης νεας προφητειας εβδελυκται ἡ ενεργεια παρα παση τη εν κοσμω αδελφοτητι, πεπομφα ὑμιν και Κλαυδιου Απολιναριου του μακαριωτατου, γενομενου εν Ἱεραπολει της Ασιας επισκοπου, γραμματα.—Ib. c. 19.

[9] Libell. Synod. (see next note.)

[1] Συνοδος θεια και ἱερα τοπικη, εν Ἱεραπολει της Ασιας συναθροισθεισα ὑπο Απολιναριου του ταυτης ὁσιωτατου επισκοπου, και ἑτερων εικοσιεξ επισκοπων, αποκηρυξασα τε και εκκοψασα Μοντανον και Μαξιμιλλαν τους ψευδοπροφητας.—Anon. Libellus Synodicus. Ed. Gr. & Lat. cum Chytræi Catal. Concil. Argent. 1601. 4to. and reprinted thence in,—Justelli et Voelli Biblioth. Jur. Can. Vet. tom. ii. pp. 1166, et seq.

The sentence of the Asiatic saints on this subject, as far as regarded the *rejection* of the Montanist views and pretensions, was confirmed by

The Confessors of Lyons in France, a. d. 176.

These confessors of the truth during the progress of the persecution from which they so severely suffered, wrote, while in prison, several synodical letters to the faithful, particularly to those of Asia, respecting the Montanist prophets. This circumstance is mentioned, and an extract given, by Eusebius. (Eccl. Hist. bk. v. cc. 1—4.) The meeting on this subject, and its result, are thus stated in the synodical book quoted above;—"A divine and sacred provincial synod in France convened by the Confessors, that formally proscribed Montanus and Maximilla, and its decree passed over to the faithful in Asia."[2] With this decree they sent, as we learn from Eusebius and others, letters dissuading the Asiatics from passing upon them at once the sentence of excommunication, which had, as we see, been done in the synod of Hierapolis, and probably elsewhere, and of revoking that sentence where passed, in the hope that the Church might not be divided by schism. They also sent similar letters to the then Pope, (whom some suppose to have been Anicetus, others Eleutherius, others Victor, and others Zephyrinus,) and induced him to send a letter to the same effect into Asia, *which, however, upon further information, he soon formally withdrew*, as Tertullian acknowleges.[3] We may therefore reasonably conclude, that these Confessors stopped short of excommunicating those persons at once, only from the absence of sufficient information, especially when we consider the character of those who excommunicated them in Asia.

[2] Συνοδος θεια και ἱερα τοπικη εν Γαλλια, συναθροισθεισα ὑπο των Ὁμολογητων αποκηρυξασα Μοντανον και Μαξιμιλλαν, ἡς ὁ ὁρος προς τους εν Ασια πιστους διεβη.—Anon. Libell. Synod. in Justell. Biblioth. tom. ii. p. 1169.

[3] Adv. Prax. c. 1.

With the judgment of these Confessors agrees that expressed in a work, still extant, by one of the most eminent martyrs of their church, who was afterwards their bishop, viz.

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, a. d. 177.

In his book against heresies, when speaking of those that were involved in the heresy of Montanus, (which he notices not by *name*, but by *description*, the name, probably, having hardly at that time been affixed to it,) he says,— "Unhappy persons truly, who willingly become false prophets, but in fact drive away the true prophetic gift from the Church."[4]

Passing hence into Thrace, we find the same sentiments against the Montanists firmly held by the Thracian bishops, and especially by

Sotas, Bishop of Anchialus, a. d. 180.

In the letter of Sarapion above mentioned it is said that "Sotas of Anchialus wished to cast out the evil spirit from Priscilla, and the hypocrites would not suffer him."[5]

We may also observe here, that the synodical book above mentioned notices a synod held by the most holy bishop of Anchialus, Sotas, and twelve other bishops, that condemned Montanus and Maximilla, not merely as false prophets, but the former as asserting the existence of eight hundred and seventy-eight æons [or manifestations of God in men], and styling himself the Holy Spirit.[6]

[4] Infelices vere, qui pseudo-prophetæ quidem esse volunt, propheticam vero gratiam repellunt ab Ecclesia. Contr. hæres. lib. iii. c. xi. §. 9. Ed. Massuet, p. 192.

A similar passage in book iv. c. xxxiii. § 6. p. 271, is considered by Grabe and Massuet as applying to the Montanists, but this is questionable.

[5] See below, p. 119, under Sarapion.

[6] Συνοδος θεια και ἱερα μερικη, συναθροισθεισα ὑπο του δσιωτατου επισκοπου

To the writers already mentioned as having written against the Montanists, many others succeeded, among whom we may particularly notice Miltiades, Rhodon, and Sarapion, with the bishops that subscribed their names to Sarapion's letter on this subject

Miltiades, a. d. 180—190.

The author from whom Eusebius has extracted his account of the Montanist prophets, above quoted, makes mention of Miltiades' work against them, the title of which, he says, was this, "That a prophet ought not to speak in an ecstasy."[7] This work Jerome mentions with praise, in his Life of Miltiades.[8] Tertullian, one of his opponents, calls him "*a man remarkable for sanctity and excellence.*"[9] He flourished, according to Jerome, in the times of the emperor Commodus, *i. e.* between 180 and 190.

Rhodon, a. d. 190.

An Asiatic by birth, and a disciple of Tatian at Rome. His works are spoken of in high terms by Jerome, who informs us that he published "a noble work against the Phrygians."[1]

Sarapion, and several other Bishops, a. d. 192.

Of Sarapion, bishop of Antioch, and his letter against

Αχιλων,* Σωτᾶ, και ἑτερων δυοκαιδεκα επισκοπων· ἡτις ελεγξασα απεκηρυξε . . . . . Μοντανον συν Μαξιμιλλη, οκτακοσιους και ἑβδομηκοντα οκτω αιωνας δογματιζοντα, και Πνευμα Ἁγιον ἑαυτον ειναι επιφημιζοντα.—Anon. Libell. Synod. in Justell. Biblioth. tom. ii. p. 1168.

[7] Περι του μη δειν προφητην εν εκστασει λαλειν.—Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. v. c. 17.

[8] Hieron. De viris illustr. c. 39.

[9] Virum sanctitate et præstantia insignem. Tertull. adv. Valentin. c. 5.

[1] Adversum Phrygas insigne opus. Hieron. De vir. illustr. c. 37.

---

* The modern Greeks call Anchialus Αχιλω, and this synodical book is supposed to have been compiled about the year 900. That Anchialus is the place meant, there can be no doubt, from the letter of Sarapion.

the Montanists, we have already made some mention in the extract from Eusebius, given above under Apolinarius. Eusebius also informs us, that—"in that same epistle of Sarapion, are contained also the subscriptions of *several bishops*, of whom one has subscribed in this way, 'I, Aurelius Cyrenius, martyr, wish you health;' and another in this way, 'Ælius Publius Julius, bishop of Debeltum, a colony of Thrace; I solemnly aver, that the blessed saint Sotas of Anchialus wished to cast out the evil spirit from Priscilla, and the hypocrites would not suffer him.' And in the letter alluded to are contained the signatures of *many other bishops*, written with their own hands, agreeing with these."[2] This letter is also mentioned by Jerome.

The next testimony I would refer to is that of one of the most eminent members of the African, and indeed of the Catholic, Church, viz.

Clement of Alexandria, a. d. 194.

This valuable writer, who united much learning with much piety, observes in his Stromata, when speaking of false prophets, "But among their falsehoods they said some things also that were true, and in truth they prophesied *in a state of ecstasy, as ministers of the Apostate.*"[3]

And in another part of the same work he tells us of the reproach cast by the Montanists and other heretics upon those who did not adhere to them, as persons who were still in their natural state, and *destitute of the Spirit.* "Let

[2] Εν ταυτη δε τη του Σαραπιωνος επιστολη και ὑποσημειωσεις φερονται διαφορων επισκοπων· ὡν ὁ μεν τις ὡδε πως ὑπεσημηνατο. Αυρηλιος Κυρηνιος μαρτυς ερρωσθαι ὑμας ευχομαι. Ὁ δε τις τουτον τον τρόπον. Αιλιος Πουπλιος Ιουλιος απο Δεβελτου κολωνειας της Θρακης επισκοπος· ζη ὁ Θεος ὁ εν τοις ουρανοις, ὁτι Σωτας ὁ μακαριος ὁ εν Αγχιαλω ηθελησε τον δαιμονα της Πρισκιλλης εκβαλειν, και ὁι ὑποκριται ουκ αφηκαν. Και αλλων δε πλειονων τον αριθμον επισκοπων συμψηφων τουτοις εν τοις δηλωθεισι γραμμασιν αυτογραφοι φερονται σημειωσεις. —Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. v. c. 19.

[3] Εν δε τοις ψευδεσι και αληθη τινα ελεγον ὁι ψευδοπροφηται, και τω οντι ὑυτοι εν εκστασει προεφητευον, ὡς αν Αποστατου διακονοι.—Strom. lib. i. § 17. Ed. Potter. 1715. Vol. i. pp. 368, 9.

not, therefore, [he says,] the above-mentioned persons call us, by way of reproach, natural men; nor moreover the Phrygians. For now *they* also call those who do not adhere to the new prophecy, *natural men*; against whom we shall treat in our work 'Concerning prophecy.'"[4] And in another part, he again speaks of "the heresy of the Phrygians."[5]

The reproach here alluded to was very generally cast upon the Church by the followers of Montanus, who, as Tertullian himself informs us in his books on Monogamy, and on Chastity, written after he became a Montanist, *called it "the church of natural men,"*[6] *but their own "the church of the Spirit."*[7] The term of reproach here used, occurs 1 Cor. ii. 14, James iii. 15, and Jude 19, a reference to which passages will show what idea it was intended to convey.

There is also one more work worth noticing of those expressly written on the subject, viz. that of

Apollonius, a. d. 211.

He is called by Jerome a most eloquent man, and is said by him to have written a large and noble work against Montanus and his prophetesses, from which he gives an extract.[8] A considerable extract is also given by Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. bk. 5. c. 18. This work is said by Jerome to have been replied to by Tertullian.[9]

[4] Μη τοινυν ψυχικους εν ονειδους μερει λεγοντων ἡμας οι προειρημενοι, αλλα και οι Φρυγες. Ηδη γαρ και ουτοι τους τη νεα προφητεια μη προσεχοντας ψυχικους καλουσιν. Προς ους εν τοις Περι προφητειας διαλεξομεθα.—Lib. iv. § 13. vol. i. pp. 604, 5.

[5] Των αιρεσεων . . . . ἡ των Φρυγων.—Lib. 7. § 17. vol. ii. p. 900.

[6] Ecclesia psychichorum.

[7] Ecclesia Spiritus.

[8] Vir disertissimus, scripsit adversus Montanum, Priscam, et Maximillam, insigne et longum volumen," &c. Hieron. De vir. illustr. c. 40.

[9] Jerome and Eusebius (Eccl. Hist. lib. v. c. 18) both state, that Apollonius mentions in this work, that at the time he wrote, it was the *fortieth* year from the time when Montanus first pretended to prophesy, which, according to the date assigned above to the rise of Montanism, brings it to

From this period the Church and the Montanists appear to have become more completely separated, and hence to have come less into immediate collision with each other. The subsequent Fathers, therefore, contented themselves with expressing their opinions upon the matter, when their subject happened to lead to it; and of these testimonies the following are particularly valuable. I have arranged them merely in chronological order, and begin with that of

Origen, A. D. 235—247.

There are several passages in the writings of Origen that clearly mark his opinion on this subject. A direct condemnation of the Montanists, or, as he calls them, Cataphrygians, may be found in a passage in his Commentary on Titus, cited by Pamphilus in his "Apology for Origen," in which Origen speaks of "the Cataphrygians . . . who follow false prophets." [1] For his sentiments on the more general question, I refer the reader to the following extracts.

The first is from his sixth homily on Ezekiel, written about the year 235, in which he speaks thus: "When I consider the fortitude of the prophets, I am full of wonder at the way in which these men, putting their trust in God rather than man, despised death, dangers, reproaches, and all things which they suffered from those who were reproved

about the year 211, or the close of the reign of Severus, which must be about right, as he is said by Jerome to have flourished during the reigns of Commodus and Severus. And it was just at this period, viz. the year 211, that Tertullian wrote his books in defence of the Montanists. The extracts from his work given by Jerome and Eusebius relate more particularly to some charges against the Montanist prophetesses for dressing finely and receiving money from their followers, but in these he seems to have trusted greatly to report. Respecting the former, it is evident from Tertullian that they were particularly plain and simple, except in their public meetings, where the prophetesses appeared in what they considered a suitable dress. The latter is particularly denied by Jerome, who also informs us that Maximilla and Priscilla were noble and opulent women.

[1] "Cataphrygæ . . observantes falsos prophetas."—Orig. fragm. Comment. in Tit. cit. a Pamph. Mart. in Apolog. pro. Orig. (Op. Orig., Ed. Gryn. Basil. 1571, tom. 1, pp. 760, 1.)

by them, while obeying the will of God in prophesying. I used to admire Isaiah before I compared him with Ezekiel, and wondered how he could say, 'Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah. To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord.' [Is. i. 10, 11.] For he said these things when he had it in his own power to speak or to be silent. For the prophets did not, as some suppose, lose their understanding and speak from a constraint of the Spirit. 'If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, says the apostle, let the first hold his peace.' [1 Cor. xiv. 30.] By which it is shown, that he who speaks has the power to speak when he pleases, and to be silent when he pleases. And it is said to Balaam, 'Only the word that I put into thy mouth, that observe to speak;' [Numb. xxii. 35;] implying that he had the power after he had received the word of God to speak or to be silent. . . Let us observe, then, the prophecy itself, and first let us consider how it was placed in the power of the prophet, whether to speak or not. The word of the Lord came unto him, saying, 'Son of man, cause Jerusalem to know her abominations, and say, Thus saith the Lord.' [Ezek. xvi. 1, 2.] The Lord placed it not in a constraining impulse of inspiration, but in the will of the speaker, that he should testify to Jerusalem her abominations, and says, *Say*. What shalt thou say? These things which follow. It was in the power of the prophet who heard the command, *Say*, whether he should speak or not, as it was placed in the power of Jonah. For it was in his power when he heard the command, 'Say, yet three days and Nineveh shall be overthrown,' [Jonah iii. 4, *Sept.*] to speak or to be silent at his will. And because it was placed in his own choice, and he was unwilling to speak, observe what calamities followed him afterwards; the ship was endangered on his account, he is found by chance in a corner, thrown out, and swallowed by a whale."[2]

[2] "Consideranti mihi constantiam prophetarum, miraculum subit quomodo vere credentes Deo magis quam hominibus contempserint mortem, pericula,

The next is from his commentary on St. John, of which the former part, in which this occurs, is said to have been written about the year 222.

"'This spake he, not of himself.' [John xi. 51.] From which I think that we learn, that we mortals speak some things of ourselves, without any superior power urging us to speak, but other things through some power whispering, as it were, and suggesting to us what we say, although we are not altogether abstracted in mind, and unconscious of what we utter, but appear to understand what we say. It is possible that we may understand ourselves in what we say, and not understand the purport of what is said. As here Caiaphas the high priest, neither spoke of himself, nor spoke the meaning of what he said, since he did not receive the prophecy contained in what he uttered. And Paul says there are some teachers of the law who understand neither what they say nor whereof they affirm. But *a wise man is not one of that sort*, for of such, Solomon, in the book of Proverbs, says, A wise man will understand what

contumelias et omnia quæ passi sunt ab eis qui arguebantur, dum voluntati Dei in prophetatione deserviunt. Admirabar quondam Esaiam, antequam compararem Ezechieli, et obstupescebam quomodo diceret: Audite sermonem Domini principes Sodomorum, attendite legem Dei populus Gomorræ. Quo mihi multitudinem sacrificiorum vestrorum, dicit Dominus? [Is. i. 10, 11.] Dicebat enim hæc cum posset dicere vel tacere. Neque enim (ut quidam suspicantur) mente excidebant prophetæ, et ex necessitate spiritus loquebantur. Si alii, inquit Apostolus, revelatum fuerit sedenti, prior taceat. [1 Cor. xiv. 30.] Ex quo ostenditur, potestatem habere eum qui loquitur, cum velit dicere, et cum velit tacere. Et ad Balaam dicitur: Veruntamen verbum quod immitto in os tuum, hoc observa loqui; quasi potestatem habente eo, ut, accepto verbo Dei, diceret, seu taceret . . . Videamus ergo ipsam prophetiam, et primo quidem, quomodo in potestate sit positum Prophetæ utrum dicat, an non, consideremus. Factus est sermo Domini ad eum, dicens: *Fili hominis testificare Hierusalem iniquitates ejus, et dices, Hæc dicit Dominus.* Non in necessitate aspirationis, sed in voluntate dicentis Dominus posuit ut testificaretur ad Hierusalem iniquitates ejus, et ait, *Dices.* Quid dices? Hæc quæ sequuntur. In propheta erat audiente *Dices*, utrum diceret necne, quomodo fuit positum in Jona. In potestate quippe ejus erat audientis, *Dic, adhuc tres dies et Ninive subvertetur*, si velit dicere vel tacere. Et quia in arbitrio ejus positum erat, et noluit dicere, vide quanta eum sunt consequuta postea; periclitata est navis propter eum, sorte repertus est latens, cetus devoravit abjectum."—Orig. in Ezech. c. xvi. hom. 6. init. tom. i. pp. 636-7.

proceedeth from his own mouth, and will carry knowledge on his lips. [Prov. xvi. 23. *Sept. transl.*]"[3]

The next is from his commentary on the Romans, written somewhere about the year 235.

"'The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.' He calls them subject to the prophets, not as inferiors to a superior, but on this account, that any one who has the spirit of prophecy is not compelled to speak involuntarily, *as those who have unclean spirits*, but speaks when he pleases and reason requires; and when it shall not appear a fit opportunity to speak, is silent, well knowing that there is a time to be silent and a time to speak."[4]

The last passage I shall quote is in his treatise against Celsus, written about the year 247, where, speaking of the Pythian priestess, he says;—

"But the throwing her who prophesies into an ecstasy and a state of enchantment, *so that she does not understand herself*, is not the work of the Divine Spirit. . .Whence we prove, arguing from the sacred Scriptures, that the prophets among the Jews, being enlightened by the Divine Spirit, as far as it was beneficial to the prophets themselves, received *beforehand* the influx of the superior power within themselves; and through the commixture (so to speak) of

[3] Τουτο αφ' εαυτου ουκ ειπεν· αφ' ου μανθανειν οιμαι ἡμας, ὁτι τινα μεν ὁι ανθρωποι αφ' εαυτων λεγομεν, μηδεμιας ἡμας ενεργουσης εις το λεγειν δυναμεως, ἑτερα δ' ὡσπερει ὑπηχουσης και ὑποβαλλουσης δυναμεως τινος ἡμιν τω λεγομενα, καω μη τελεον εξισταμεθα, και απαρακολουθητως εχομεν ἑαυτοις, αλλα δοκωμεν παρακολουθειν ὁις λεγομεν· ενδεχεται, παρακολουθουντας ἡμας ἑαυτοις ἡ λεγομεν μη παρακολουθειν τω βουληματι των λεγομενων· ὡσπερ νυν Καιαφας ὁ αρχιερευς και αφ' ἑαυτου ουκ ειπε, και ουκ ειπε τον νουν, ὡς προφητειαν λεγομενου ουκ εδεχετο· και παρα Παυλω δε νομοδιδασκαλοι τινες εισι μη νοουντες, μητε ἁ λεγουσι, μητε περι τινων διαβεβαιουνται. Αλλ' ουχ ὁ σοφος τοιουτος, περι ὁυ φησιν εν παροιμιαις ὁ Σολομων· σοφος νοησει τα απο ιδιου στοματος, επι δε χειλεσι φορεσει επιγνωμοσυνην.—Orig. in Joh. xi. 49. Ed. Huetio, Rothom. 1668. vol. ii. pp. 364, 5.

[4] "Spiritus prophetarum prophetis subjecti sunt. Subjectos dicens prophetarum, non quasi meliori inferiores, sed pro eo quod habens quis prophetiæ spiritum non invitus loqui cogitur, ut illi qui habent spiritus immundos, sed cum vult, et ratio postulat, dicit: cum vero dicere opportunum non videbitur, silet, bene sciens quia tempus tacendi sit et tempus loquendi." Origen. in Rom. c. 8. lib. 7, tom. 2, pp, 567, 8.

him who is called the Holy Spirit with their soul, they became both more clear-sighted, as respects the understanding, and more pure in soul. . . . But if the Pythian priestess is in an ecstasy, and is not herself when she utters her divinations, what sort of a spirit is that to be thought that brings darkness upon the understanding and reasoning powers? It is surely such as is that race of evil spirits whom not a few Christians drive out from those who are suffering under them," &c.[5]

Firmilian of Cæsarea, a.d. 256.

In a letter to Cyprian, written chiefly on the subject of rebaptizing those who had been baptized by heretics, he says—" According to which, they also who are called Cataphrygians, and set up for new prophets, can neither have the Father, nor the Son, nor the Holy Spirit; of whom if we ask what Christ they preach, they will answer that they preach him who sent the spirit that spoke through Montanus and Prisca."—" Since some were doubtful as to the baptism of those who, although they receive the new prophets, yet seem to acknowledge the same Father and Son with us; most of us having assembled together at Iconium, discussed the matter very carefully, and confirmed the opinion that every baptism is to be altogether rejected that is performed out of the Church."[6]

[5] Αλλα και το εις εκστασιν και μαγικην αγειν καταστασιν την δηθεν προφητευουσαν [i. e. την Πυθιαν,] ὡς μηδαμως αυτην ἑαυτη παρακολουθειν, ου Θειου Πνευματος εργον εστιν.——Ὁθεν ἡμεις αποδεικνυμεν, συναγοντες απο των ἱερων γραμματων, ὁτι ὁι εν Ιουδαιοις προφηται, ελλαμπομενοι ὑπο του Θειου Πνευματος τοσουτον ὁσον ην και αυτοὶς τοις προφητευουσι χρησιμον, προαπελαβον της του κρειττονος εις αυτους επιδημιας· και δια της προς την ψυχην αυτων (ἱν' ὁυτως ονομασω) ἀφης του καλουμενου Ἁγιου Πνευματος, διορατικωτεροι τε τον νουν εγινοντο, και την ψυχην λαμπροτεροι.——Ει δ' εξισταται, και ουκ εν ἑαυτη εστιν ἡ Πυθια, ὁτε μαντευεται, ποδαπον νομιστεον πνευμα, το σκοτον καταχεαν του νου και των λογισμων, ἡ τοιουτον ὁποιον εστι και το των δαιμονων γενος, ὁυς ουκ ολιγοι Χριστιανων απελαυνουσι των πασχοντων, κ. τ. λ.—Origen. contra Cels. lib. 7, sub init. (Ed. Spencer, Cantab. 1677, 4to. pp. 333, 4.)

I have ventured in the translation *(as it does not affect the sentiment contained in the passage,* and seems almost requisite,) to put the note of interrogation after λογισμων, and read ἡ for ἡ.

[6] " Secundum quod etiam illi qui κατα φρυγας appellantur, et novas prophe-

Eusebius, a. d. 328.

The opinion of Eusebius is sufficiently evident from the extracts already given from his Ecclesiastical History. If any further proof were wanting, it might be found in bk. 5. c. 14, where, just before he gives the account extracted above, he speaks of Montanus and his followers (such was the horror this great and good man had of their pretended gifts) as acting "like venomous reptiles."[7]

The Book of Canons of the Universal Church. a. d. 364 and 380.

The 112th canon of this book, which is the eighth canon of the synod of Laodicea, held in the year 364, or, according to others, 367, runs thus:—"That it is right, that they who turn from the heresy of those called Phrygians, even if they should happen to be of the number of those who are reckoned among them the clergy, and should be said to be of the highest rank, that such should both be catechized with great care, and baptized by both the bishops and priests of the Church."[8]

Again, in the 170th canon of this book, or the seventh

tias usurpare conantur, nec Patrem possunt habere nec Filium, nec Spiritum Sanctum; a quibus si queramus quem Christum prædicent, respondebunt eum se prædicare qui miserit spiritum per Montanum et Priscam locutum."—"Plane quoniam quidam de eorum baptismo dubitabant, qui, etsi novos prophetas recipiunt, eosdem tamen Patrem et Filium nosse nobiscum videntur; plurimi simul convenientes in Iconio diligentissime tractavimus; et confirmavimus repudiandum esse omne omnino baptisma quod sit extra Ecclesiam constitutum."—Firmil. Ep. ad Cypr. apud Cypr. Epist. lxxv. Ed. Fell. Oxon. 1682, P. 2, pp. 221 and 226.

[7] Ιοβολων δικην ἑρπετων.—Eccl. Hist. lib. 5. c. 14.

[8] Περι του, τους απο της ἁιρεσεως των λεγομενων Φρυγων επιστρεφοντας, ει και εν κληρω νομιζομενω παρ' αυτοις τυγχανοιεν, ει και μεγιστοι λεγοιντο, τους τοιουτους μετα πασης επιμελειας κατηχεισθαι τε και βαπτιζεσθαι ὑπο των της Εκκλησιας επισκοπων τε και πρεσβυτερων.—Justelli Biblioth. Jur. Canon. Vet. vol. i. p. 50.

canon of the council of Constantinople, held in the year 381, which was the second General Council, we find the following passage:—

"The Montanists, who are here called Phrygians . . . . and all other heretics . . . . all of these who wish to be admitted among the orthodox, we receive as we do the [pagan] Greeks."[9]

For the authority of this book, where it is not known, I need only mention what Bishop Barlow says of it, that it is a "book, which, next to the Bible, is the most authentic, and by the Catholic Church the most approved and received, book in the world."[1] It has even a place in the statute law of England, by an act passed in the early times of the Reformation, *i. e.* in the first year of Queen Elizabeth; (1 Eliz. c. 1. §. 36;) the words of which clearly imply that whatever is adjudged to be heresy by the canons of the first four General Councils, (which, in fact, form what is called the Book of Canons of the Universal Church,) is to be considered as such in this country.

In the Collection made by Theodore Balsamon from the early canons of the Church, we read of still severer measures being adopted towards the Montanists.[2]

Cyril of Jerusalem, a. d. 347.

In his catechetical lectures he admonishes his catechumens—"Let those who follow the Phrygians, and Montanus the head of those wicked persons, and his two prophetesses forsooth, Maximilla and Priscilla, be held in ab-

[9] *Μονταναιστας τους ενταυθα λεγομενους Φρυγας . . . . και τας αλλας πασας αιρεσεις . . . . παντας τους απ' αυτων θελοντας προστιθεσθαι τη ορθοδοξια, ως Ἑλληνας δεχομεθα.*—Ibid. p. 58.

[1] Bp. Barlow's "Two Letters concerning Justification by Faith only;" ed. 1828, p. 17.

[2] Theod. Balsamonis Eccles. Constit. Collect. lib. 1, tit. 5, No. 20; Justell. Biblioth. Jur. Canon. Vet. vol. ii. p. 1289.

horrence. . . . For this Montanus . . . . dared to say that he was the Holy Spirit, wretched man."[3]

Athanasius of Alexandria, a. d. 358.

This author also warns his readers against "the wickedness of the Phrygians, who say that the prophets do not know . . . . the things to which the messages they deliver relate."[4]

Hilary of Poictiers, a. d. 360.

In his commentary on the 119th Psalm, verses 171, 172, he says,—"But the divine precepts are not so inconsistent with equity, that it should be unbefitting the divine character to enable the prophet first to understand them, that they may by his preaching become clear to public apprehension; for it is irreconcilable with the goodness of God, either to obscure what was to be uttered by his will, or to have given any precept but what is consistent with equity. But this is the principal point in the equity of God's precepts, their being such as to be beneficial to all."[5] And in another place he speaks of "the *blasphemies*" of that archheretic, Montanus."[6]

[3] Μισεισθωσαν δι κατα Φρυγας, και Μοντανος, ὁ των κακων εξαρχος, και δυο δηθεν αυτου προφητιδες Μαξιμιλλα και Πρισκιλλα . . . . Ὁ γαρ Μοντανος ὁυτος . . . ετολμησεν ειπειν ἑαυτον ειναι το Ἁγιον Πνευμα ὁ αθλιωτατος.—Catech. xvi. § 4. Ed. Milles, 1703, p. 227.

[4] Των Φρυγων παρανομιαν των λεγοντων μη ειδεναι τους προφητας . . . . . περι τινων απαγγελλουσιν.—Orat. 3a. contra Arianos. Ed. Bened. Vol. i. p. 596.

[5] "Non sunt autem ita mandata Dei ab æquitate diversa, ut non Deo dignum sit, eorum primùm intelligentiam tribuere prophetanti, tum deinde ad conscientiæ publicæ notionem prædicationis confessione clarescere: quia extra bonitatem Dei sit, aut occultare quod voluerit pronuntiari, aut aliud aliquid nisi cum æquitate mandasse. Æquitatis autem mandatorum Dei ea summa est, ut omnibus sint salutaria." Hilar. Pictav. Tract. in Psalm. cxix. 171, 172. Ed. Bened. Paris. 1693, col. 366.

[6] "Blasphemiis Montani hæreticorum omnium ducis." Ex Op. Histor. fragm. 3. Ead. ed. col. 1309.

Basil the Great, a. d. 370.

This excellent Father, in his commentary on Isaiah, has the following important passage on this subject;—

"But there are some who say that they prophesy in a state of ecstasy, their human understanding being overshadowed and obscured by the Spirit. But this is irreconcilable with their boast of having the Divine presence with them, that it should disable the mind of him who is divinely inspired; and that when he has become full of the divine counsels, he should then be estranged even from his own understanding, *and that when he is making himself useful to others, he should himself fail of receiving profit from his own words.* In every respect, indeed, what probability is there, that a man should become like one mad from the influence of the Spirit of wisdom, and should incur the suspension of his intellectual powers from the influence of the Spirit of knowledge? For the light does not produce blindness, but awakes that faculty of vision which nature has imparted. Nor does the Spirit bring darkness upon the souls of men, but rouses the mind that is pure from the stains of sin to the contemplation of those things that are within the reach of its intellectual powers. That the power of the wicked one, indeed, should bring confusion upon the understanding, when craftily plotting against human nature, is by no means improbable. But to say that the presence of the Divine Spirit produces the same effect, is impious. Moreover, if the saints are endued with wisdom, how is it that they do not correspond to what the prophet has said, for he says, 'A wise man will understand what proceedeth from his own mouth, and will carry knowledge on his lips.' [Prov. xvi. 23. Sept. transl.]"[7] He then proceeds to observe, that if from the

[7] Φασι δε τινες εξεστηκοτας αυτους προφητευειν, επικαλυπτομενου του ανθρωπειου νου παρα του Πνευματος, τουτο δε παρα την επαγγελιαν εστι της θειας επιδημιας, εκφρονα ποιειν τον θεοληπτον, και ὁτε πληρης γεγονε των θειων διδαγματων, τοτε και της οικειας εξιστασθαι διανοιας, και αλλους μεν ωφελουντα δι' εαυτου, αυτον δε της εκ των ιδιων λογων απολειπεσθαι ωφελειας. Ὁλως δε τινα

word *ecstasy* being used (See the Sept. Transl.) to describe the state of Isaac at the entrance of Esau, (Gen. xxvii. 33), and to express the feelings of David, (Ps. xxx. 22, and cxv. 2., in *Sept.*, corresponding to Ps. xxxi. 22, and cxvi. 11, *Heb. and our trans.*), "any falsely accuse the saints of alienation of mind, let them know that a great surprise is called ecstasy."[8]

Again, further on, he says,—"Of all our senses that which has the clearest perception of sensible objects is sight . . . . Wherefore the revelations discovered to the view of the true prophets were called visions, on account of their clear and unambiguous manifestation. Whence also a prophet was called a seer and a foreseer."—"But having first set before us a vision, he has added a relation of words delivered to him . . . so as to show that he did not receive them by his hearing, but relates the meaning of the discourse as imprinted upon his mind. For we indeed must use a voice to make known our thoughts, but God acts upon *the understanding itself* of those who are worthy, and imprints upon them the knowledge of his own will."[9]

λογον ακολουθον εχει, εκ του της σοφιας Πνευματος μεμηνοτι παραπλησιον γινεσθαι· και εκ του της γνωσεως Πνευματος το παρακολουθητικον αποβαλλειν. [;] Αλλ' ουτε το φως τυφλοτητα εμποιει, αλλα την εκ φυσεως ενυπαρχουσαν ὁρατικην δυναμιν διεγειρει· ουτε το Πνευμα σκοτωσιν εμποιει ταις ψυχαις, αλλα προς την των νοητων θεωριαν τον απο των της αμαρτιας κηλιδων καθαρευοντα νουν διανιστησι. Πονηραν μεν ουν δυναμιν συγχυτικην ειναι διανοιας, επιβουλευουσαν τη ανθρωπινη φυσει, ουκ απιθανον· Θειου δε Πνευματος παρουσιαν ταυτο τουτο λεγειν ενεργειν, ασεβες. Επειτα ει σοφοι ὁι ἁγιοι, πως ουκ επηκολουθουν τοις προφητευομενοις; σοφος γαρ, φησι, νοησει τα απο του ιδιου στοματος, επι δε χειλεσι φορει επιγνωμοσυνην.—[Prov. xvi. 23, Sept.] Basil. Comment. in Is. Vis. 1ª. Ed. Paris. 1618, vol. i. p. 806.

[8] Την παραφοραν καταψευδονται των ἁγιων, γινωσκετωσαν την εκπληξιν εκστασιν ειρησθαι.—Ib.

[9] Των παρ' ἡμιν αισθητηριων το ενεργεστατην την καταληψιν εχον των αισθητων ὁρασις εστιν.—Διοπερ ἡ των αληθων θεωρια δια το εναργες και αναμφιβολον ὁρασις προσηγορευται. Ὁθεν και ὁ ὁρων εκαλειτο ὁ προφητης, και ὁ εμπροσθεν ὁρων. . . . . Ὁρασιν δε προταξας, λογων απαγγελιαν επηγαγεν, ἱνα δειξη ὁτι ου δι' ακοης εδεξατο, αλλα τω νω εντυπωθεισαν του λογου την διανοιαν εξαγγελλει. Και γαρ ἡμιν φωνης μεν χρεια προς το σημαινειν ἡμων τα νοηματα ὁ δε Θεος αυτου του ἡγεμονικου των αξιων ἁπτομενος την του ιδιου βουληματος γνωσιν αυτοις εντυποι.—Ib. Vis. 2ª. pp. 809, 810.

Epiphanius of Constantia, a. d. 375.

This author, in his celebrated work against heresies, assigns the forty-eighth division to the heresy of the Phrygists, as he calls them; against which, among other remarks, we find the following:—

"But they have cut themselves off, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils, [1 Tim. iv. 1,] saying that it behoves us, as he expresses it, to receive the gifts."—"But whatever the prophets spoke, they spoke intelligently, understanding what they were saying, and the things spoken by them were fulfilled, and are yet fulfilling"—"For with the prophets, when there was occasion, the holy men of that period uttered all their prophecies with an uncounterfeited spirit, and a sound judgment, and a mind conscious of the meaning of what they said, full of the Holy Spirit, according to the measure of the spiritual gifts given to each, and according to the measure of their faith, [alluding to Rom. xii. 6, and 1 Cor. xii. 7,] so as to speak profitably. . . . . For comparing the things spoken by them, and the real circumstances, facts, and prophecies of the Old and New Testament, let us judge what is prophecy, and what is false prophecy. The prophet spoke with his reasoning faculties undisturbed, and understood what he was saying, and spoke by the Holy Spirit, uttering every thing in a sound state of mind. . . . . The prophet in the Old Testament was called a seer. . . . . When he came to the people he said, 'Thus saith the Lord.' See you not that the word was delivered by one who understood it, and not by one in an ecstasy, nor like a mere utterance from one whose understanding is in a state of ecstasy? And so Ezekiel . . . For these are in good truth the effusions of prophets who possessed, through the Holy Spirit, a sound mind, doctrine, and discourse. And is not Daniel found full of all wisdom . . . . through the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit that in very deed gives wisdom to the prophet, and through the prophet to those who are thought worthy

of receiving the true doctrine? But what these people profess to prophesy, they appear to do neither in a calm state of mind, nor understanding what they say, for their words are extraordinary and incoherent, and have no propriety."—"But the prophets were sometimes in an ecstasy. Not in an ecstasy that affected their reason. But Peter also was in an ecstasy. Not in a state that he did not understand what was said, but in a state in which he saw things differently to what his ordinary conceptions would have enabled him to do, beyond the power of human vision. For he saw," &c. [referring to Acts x. 11, &c.]—"But if, again, they shall say, the first spiritual gifts are not like the last, whence can they show this? For the holy prophets and the holy apostles prophesied like one another."—"Every prophet, therefore, both in the Old and New Testament, is found understanding what he spake. As also St. John in the Apocalypse said, 'These things hath the Lord revealed to his servants by his servant John.' And, 'Thus saith the Lord.' He who speaks thus had a sound mind, and understood what he said."—"The holy apostles, when they had received the Spirit as the Paraclete, glorified Christ . . . . but Montanus glorifies himself only, and says, that he is the Almighty Father, and that he [*i. e.* the Almighty Father] hath taken up his abode in him."—"Observe here that one who spake thus, clearly showed that he spoke by constraint, not voluntarily. But our Lord did not come without his own free will into the world, nor was he sent by the Father by compulsion . . . . And so whom he hath called, he called with their own will preconsenting, [See Ps. cx. 3,] not putting a restraint upon them, not placing a yoke upon them."[1]

[1] Απεσχισαν δ' εαυτους προσεχουσαι πνευμασι πλανης και διδασκαλιαις δαιμονων, λεγοντες· ὁτι δει ἡμας, φησι, και τα χαρισματα δεχεσθαι.—Ὁσα γαρ ὁι Προφηται ειρηκασι, και μετα συνεσεως παρακολουθουντες εφθεγγοντο, και ετελεσθησαν τα παρ' αυτων ειρημενα, και ετι πληρουται.—Ὁτε γαρ την χρεια, εν προφηταις [,] εν αληθινω πνευματι, και ερρωμενη διανοια, και παρακολουθουντι νω, ὁι αυτου ἁγιοι τα παντα προεφητευσαν· εμπιπλωμενοι Πνευματος Ἁγιου, κατα την αναλογιαν των εκ Πνευματος χαρισματων ἑκαστω διδομενων, και κατα την αναλογιαν της πιστεως προς το συμφερον. . . . . Συγκρινοντες γαρ τα παρ' αυτων ειρημενα, και κατα την

Gregory of Nazianzum, a. d. 375.

This Father speaks in three separate places of "the wicked spirit of Montanus."[2]

An author said to be Ambrose of Milan, a. d. 375.

In the Treatise concerning Solomon, ascribed to the excellent Ambrose, the author, comparing the Church to a

Παλαιαν Διαθηκην και Καινην εν αληθεια οντα, και εν αληθεια γενομενα, και πεπροφητευμενα, δοκιμασωμεν ποια προφητεια τυγχανει, και ποια ψευδοπροφητεια. Ὁ προφητης μετα καταστασεως λογισμων, και παρακολουθησεως ελαλει, και εφθεγγετο εκ Πνευματος Ἁγιου, τα παντα ερρωμενως λεγων . . . . . Ὁ βλεπων ελεγετο προφητης εν τη Παλαια Διαθηκη . . . . . Ελθων προς τον λαον εφη, Ταδε λεγει Κυριος· Ουχ ὁρας ὁτι παρακολουθουντος ὁ λογος, και ουκ εξισταμενου, ουτε ὡς εξισταμενης διανοιας ἡ φθογγη απεδιδοτο; Ὡσαυτως δε και Ιεζεκιηλ. . . . Ταυτα γαρ αληθως Προφητων εν Ἁγιω Πνευματι ερρωμενην εχοντων την διανοιαν, και την διδασκαλιαν, και την διαλογην· ὁ δε Δανιηλ ουχ ἑυρισκεται πασης συνεσεως εμπλεως. . . . δια το χαρισμα του Ἁγιου Πνευματος, το σοφιζον οντως τον Προφητην, και τους δια του Προφητου της διδασκαλιας της αληθειας καταξιουμενους. Ἁ δ' ὁυτοι επαγγελλονται προφητευειν, ουτε ευσταθουντες φανουνται, ουτε παρακολουθιαν λογου εχοντες, λοξα γαρ τα παρ' αυτων ῥηματα, και σκαληνα, και ουδεμιας ορθοτητος εχομενα.—Γεγονασι δε εν εκστασει ὁι Προφηται, [.] ουκ εν εκστασει λογισμων. Γεγονε γαρ και Πετρος εν εκστασει, [.] ουχι μη παρακολουθων τω λογω, αλλ' ὁρων της καθημερινης ακολουθιας ἑτερα παρα τοις ανθρωποις ὁρωμενα. Ειδε γαρ, κ. τ. λ. —Ει δε και παλιν θελησουσι λεγειν, ουχ ὁμοια τα πρωτα χαρισματα τοις εσχατοις, ποθεν τουτο εχουσι δειξαι; ὁμοιως γαρ αλληλοις ὁι ἁγιοι προφηται και ὁι ἁγιοι Αποστολοι προεφητευσαν.—Πας τοινυν προφητευων παρακολουθων ἑυρισκεται, καν τε εν τη Παλαια Διαθηκη καν τε εν τη Καινη· ὡς και ὁ ἁγιος Ιωαννης εν τη Αποκαλυψει ελεγε· Ταδε απεκαλυψε Κυριος τοις αυτου δουλοις, δια του δουλου αυτου Ιωαννου. Και, Ταδε λεγει Κυριος. Ὁ ταυτα λεγων ερρωμενην ειχε την διανοιαν και παρηκολουθει.—Ὁι ἁγιοι αποστολοι το Παρακλητον Πνευμα λαβοντες Χριστον εδοξασαν. . . . . ὁ Μοντανος δε ἑαυτον δοξαζει μονον, και λεγει ειναι Πατερα παντοκρατορα, και εν αυτω ενοικησαι.—Ὁρα γαρ ενταυθα τον ὁυτως λαλησαντα, ηναγκασμενον ἑαυτον αποφηναντα, ουχ ἑκουσια γνωμη. Ὁ δε Κυριος ἡμων ουκ ακων ηλθεν εις τον κοσμον, ουδε μετα αναγκης απο Πατρος απεσταλη. . . . Ὁυτω και ὁυς εκαλεσε, μετα προαιρεσεως κεκληκεν, ουκ αναγκην επιβαλλων, ου κλοιον επιτιθεμενος. Epiphan. adv. Hær. in hær. 48. Κατα Φρυγαστων, ειτ' ουν Μοντανιστων καλουμενων. Op. ed. Paris. 1622. Vol. i. pp. 402—415. Possibly the true reading in l. 4 is, ὁτε γαρ ην χρεια προφηται, εν κ. τ. λ.

[2] Μοντανου το πονηρον πνευμα.—Orat. 14, 23, and 25. Ed. Paris, 1630. Vol. i. pp. 221, 414, 441.

ship, says,—" Which [like a ship] is tossed with frequent tempests, that is, with the stripes and blows of temptations; which the stormy waves, that is, the power of this world, endeavour to bring upon the rocks. Which, although she is often harassed by the waves or storms, can never suffer shipwreck, because on her mast, that is, on the cross, Christ is lifted up, at her helm sits the Father as her pilot, and the Spirit, the Paraclete, guards her prow. Twelve rowers, that is, the twelve apostles, and a like number of prophets, guide her into port through the narrow straits of this world. On the one hand, the caverns of Montanus, begirt with two prophetesses, the wild dog-like Priscilla and Maximilla, like any Scylla, resound with the howlings of a counterfeit song. Embarked in that ship of the Church, we pass prosperously by these. On the other hand, we do not strike against the Fotinian Charybdis," &c. &c.[3]

Hilary the Deacon, a. d. 380.

This author, in his Comment. on 1 Thess. v. 19—22, "Quench not the Spirit, despise not prophesyings, prove all things, hold fast that which is good, abstain from all

[3] . . . . . "Quæ crebris ventorum fluctibus, id est tentationum plagis et verberibus fatigatur; quam turbidi fluctus, id est, hujus seculi potestas conatur ad saxa perducere. Quæ etsi undarum fluctibus aut procellis sæpe vexatur tamen nunquam potest sustinere naufragium, quia in arbore ejus, id est, in cruce, Christus erigitur, in puppi Pater residet gubernator, proram Paracletus servat Spiritus. Hanc per angusta hujus mundi freta duodeni in portum remiges ducunt, id est, duodecim apostoli et similis numerus prophetarum. Inde Montani antra latratu falsi carminis resonant, qui duabus fœminis prophetissis Priscillæ et Maximillæ tanquam alicujus Scyllæ rabidis succinctus est canibus. In ista nave Ecclesiæ ea feliciter præterimus. Inde in Fotinianam Charybdim non incidimus," &c, Ambros. Lib. de Salomone, c. 4. Ed. Basil. 1567, vol. iv. p. 419. This treatise is inserted in all the editions of Ambrose's works previous to the Benedictine, without any observation, except in that of Erasmus, who says that it is smart and erudite, but somewhat different (nonnihil dissonans) from the Ambrosian style. The Benedictine editors agree in Erasmus's encomium, but insert it among the doubtful works of Ambrose. They consider it a sermon, and have placed it as the 46th of the "Sermones adscripti Ambrosio."

appearance of evil," makes the following observations:— "He says this, that no one may, without some good cause, interdict one who is speaking by the Spirit; for the Spirit is quenched if the fervour of him who is beginning to speak is assuaged by contradiction; lest perchance the hearers, not understanding that spiritual things are spoken by him, offer a dishonour to the Holy Spirit, and sin through ignorance; and that every one ought to be patiently heard who professes to interpret the Scriptures, but that all his words are to be examined and thus judged of, lest perchance [if they should not hear him] while they reject the gift given to a brother, they oppose its Author. He admonishes us, therefore, that all things which are spoken are to be proved, and whatever shall have been spoken in soberness and truth is to be held fast. For whatever things agree with what was said by the apostles and our Lord himself, are to be kept and held fast, but we must keep ourselves aloof from those which seem opposed to the faith. For the spirits of the world often speak what is good deceitfully, and, as it were, in imitation; and in the midst of it introduce by stealth what is evil, that so they may gain acceptance by those things which are good, and the evil things being supposed to proceed from the same spirit, are not discerned from that which accompanies them; but that which is forbidden is commended by means of that which is allowed, on the authority of a name, not on the ground of intrinsic worth. For they are accustomed, under the name of the apostles and even of the Lord himself, to teach impious and contradictory things; and therefore he admonishes us that all things are to be proved, because the declarations of the Lord cannot possibly differ from each other. Hence it is that the apostle John says in his Epistle, 'Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God;' because if he says many good things, but yet *in anything* utters that which is contrary to the faith, he may thus be known not to be the Holy Spirit. For no error can be found in the Holy Spirit. But either by the exercise of his powers of speech he utters some spiritual and some carnal things,

for all error is to be attributed to the flesh, or certainly by some subtile invention forges what is good, that he may introduce in it what is evil, as I have mentioned above; as in Montanus and Priscilla and Maximilla, prophets of the Cataphrygians, the spirit of the world plays the hypocrite by a sort of imitation of what is good, that by his many plausible and moreover true sayings, he might pass himself off as the Holy Spirit." [4]

John Chrysostom, a. d. 398.

In his 29th homily on Corinthians, (on 1 Cor. xii. 1, 2), he thus speaks on this subject: "When any one, he says, in the temples of the idols was possessed by an

[4] "Hoc dicit ut non facile alicui per Spiritum loquenti interdicatur. Extinguitur enim, si incipientis loqui fervor contradictione sopitur, ne forte non intelligentes dici ab eo spiritalia injuriam faciant Spiritui Sancto, et peccent per ignorantiam; neque aliquem qui quasi scripturas revelet, non audiri patienter debere, sed omnia dicta examinari, et sic judicari, ne forte gratiam datam fratri dum respuunt, auferi repugnent. Omnia ergo quæ dicuntur, probanda monet; et quicquid sobrie et bene dictum fuerit retinendum. Quæcunque enim apostolorum et ipsius Domini dictis congruunt, ea bene dicta habenda sunt et retinenda: ab his autem quæ inimica fidei videntur abstinendum. Solent enim spiritus mundi fallaciter quasi per imitationem dicere bona et inter hæc subinducere prava, ut per hæc quæ bona sunt accepto ferantur, et mala, ut quia [quæ] unius spiritus dicta putantur non discernantur ab invicem; sed per id quod licitum est commendetur illicitum autoritate nominis non ratione virtutis. Solent enim sub apostolorum nomine et ipsius Domini nefanda docere et adversa; ideoque omnia probanda monet, quia non possunt eloquia Domini esse diversa. Hinc est unde et Johannis apostoli Epistola; Nolite, inquit, omni spiritui credere, sed probate spiritus si ex Deo sunt; quia si multa bona dicat, in aliquo autem quod fidei adversum est promat, sciatur non esse Spiritus Sanctus. Nihil enim erroris in Spiritu Sancto poterit reperiri. Sed aut per exercitium eloquii quædam spiritalia quædam vero carnalia, quia omnis error carni deputatur, aut certe commento quodam astutiæ bona fingit, ut his inserat mala, sicut supra memoravi; quemadmodum in Montano et Priscilla et Maximilla prophetis Cataphrygarum spiritus mundi imitatione quadam boni (a) simulat, ut per multa verosimilia necnon et vera mentiretur se esse Spiritum Sanctum." Hilar. Diac. Comment. in 1 Thess. v. 19—22. In Ambros. Op. ed. Basil. 1567. vol. v. p. 393. And in all other editions of Ambrose's works, the work having been originally ascribed to Ambrose. (See Walch. Bibl. Patr. p. 351, and Cave Hist. Liter. under "Hilarius.")

(a) Cotelerius, in his Monum. Eccles. Græc. not. ad. Damasc. adv. hæres. 48. (tom. i. p. 296.) conjectures that we ought to read *bona* for *boni* here.

unclean spirit and uttered divinations, he was violently moved like one who is being forcibly carried away, being under subjection to the spirit, understanding nothing of what he speaks. For this is the peculiar mark of a soothsayer to be in an ecstasy, to suffer constraint, to be under a violent impulse, to be exceedingly moved, to be agitated like one mad. But a prophet is not so, but speaks every thing with a sober judgment and a sound state of mind, and understanding what is spoken. So that, even before the event, you may distinguish from hence between a soothsayer and a prophet." And soon after, stating the manner in which the soothsayers spoke, not knowing what they said, he adds—"But such things do not belong to us. No, he has not stated our case, I mean that of the prophets, for every thing was clear to them, and among them they prophesied as it became them, with an understanding mind and all freedom. Wherefore also they had it in their own power either to speak or not to speak; for they were not impelled by force, but were honoured with power. Through this it was that Jonah fled; [Jon. i. 3;] through this, that Ezekiel was lifted up; [Ezek. iii. 14;] through this, that Jeremiah deprecated at first his divine mission. [Jer. i. 6.] For God did not impel them by constraint, but by counselling, exhorting, threatening them, not darkening their understanding. For it is the part of an evil spirit to make a tumult and unmeaning noise, and envelope things in obscurity; but of God, to enlighten and teach with the understanding what is necessary. This therefore is the first distinction between a soothsayer and a prophet."[5]

[5] Εν τοις ειδωλοις [ειδωλειοις SAVIL. conject.] φησιν ειποτε κατεσχεθη τις ὑπο πνευματος ακαθαρτου και εμαντευετο, ὡσπερ απαγομενος, ὑντως ἑιλκετο ὑπο του πνευματος δεδεμενος, ουδεν ειδως ὡν λεγει. Τουτο γαρ μαντεως ιδιον το εξεστηκεναι, το αναγκην ὑπομενειν, το ωθεισθαι, το ἑλκεσθαι, το συρεσθαι ὡσπερ μαινομενον. Ὁ δε προφητης ουχ ὑντως, αλλα μετα διανοιας νηφουσης και σωφρονουσης καταστασεως, και ειδως ἁ φθεγγεται φησιν ἁπαντα. Ὡστε και προ της εκβασεως καντευθεν γνωριζε τον μαντιν και τον προφητην.——Αλλ' ου τα ἡμετερα τοιαντα. Αλλ' ουκ εθηκε τα ἡμετερα, τα των προφητων λεγω· και γαρ δηλα ην αυτοις ἁπαντα· και εν αυτοις προεφητευον, ὡς αυτοις πρεπον ην, μετα

This interpretation is repeated by THEOPHYLACT in his commentary on this passage.

AUGUSTINE, A. D. 386—405.

Montanus and his prophetesses are proscribed by Augustine as heretics, in his treatise on Heresies, already alluded to, p. 110, above. On the points in dispute generally, we may see his opinion in the following passages.

In his work against the Academics, written about the year 386, he says;—"I do not call that knowledge in which he who professes it is sometimes deceived. . . . It is most truly said by some philosophers, that it can be found in no one but a wise man, who ought not only to have a clear perception of that which he defends and follows, but also to hold it fast . . . You must consider me as having said this with respect to diviners and augurs and interpreters of dreams. . . . . For I suppose that I need not give myself any trouble on this point respecting prophets who speak with an alienated mind."[6]

In his book "Against Adimantus," written about the year 394, he says;—"The third kind of [prophetic] vision is by mental intuition, in which truth and wisdom are discerned by the understanding; in the absence of which the two former kinds of vision I have mentioned [viz. by the senses and by the imagination] are either unprofitable, or

συνεσεως και ελευθεριας ἁπασης. Δια τοι τουτο και του ειπειν και του μη ειπειν ησαν κυριοι· ου γαρ αναγκη κατειχοντο, αλλ' εξουσιᾳ ησαν τετιμημενοι. Δια τουτο και Ιωνας εφυγε, δια τουτο και Ιεζεκιηλ ανεβαλλετο, δια τουτο και Ιερεμιας παρητειτο. Ὁ δε Θεος ου μετα αναγκης αυτους ωθει, αλλα συμβουλευων, παραινων, απειλων, ου σκοτων την διανοιαν. Δαιμονος μεν γαρ ιδιον το θορυβον και μανιαν ποιειν και πολυν τον ζοφον. Θεου δε το φωτιζειν και μετα συνεσεως διδασκειν τα δεοντα. Πρωτη μεν ουν διαφορα ἀντη μαντεως και προφητου. —Chrys. Hom. 29. in 1 Cor. xii. 1. Op. Ed. Savil. vol. iii. pp. 430, 431.

[6] "Scientiam non appello in qua ille qui eam profitetur aliquando fallitur. . . . Verissime a quibusdam philosophis dicitur in nullo eam posse nisi in sapiente inveniri, qui non modò perceptum habere debet id quod tuetur ac sequitur, verùm etiam inconcussum tenere . . Hoc me de haruspicibus, et de auguribus, et de his omnibus qui sidera consulunt, et de conjectoribus somniorum dixisse putatote . . . . . Nam de vatibus nihil mihi puto esse laborandum qui mente loquuntur alienâ."—August. Contr. Academ. lib. 1. c. 7. Ed. Ben. tom. i.

even lead to error. . . . He is not a prophet of the true and supreme God, who sees the visions sent from God either by the senses alone or even by the imagination, and does not see them by the mind."[7]

Jerome, A. D. 410.

This Father, in his Commentary on the Prophets, frequently alludes to the Montanists. His sentiments respecting them, on the points connected with our present subject, are amply exhibited in the following passages, which afford a full and important testimony, as far as this Father is concerned, against any pretensions to spiritual gifts made under such circumstances.

In his preface to his Comment. on Isaiah, he says,—"But the prophets did not, as Montanus with his insane women dreams, speak in an ecstasy, unconscious of the meaning of what they were saying, and, when instructing others, ignorant themselves of what they said; of whom an apostle says, *Understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm;* [1 Tim. i. 7;] but according to what Solomon says in the Proverbs, 'A wise man understands what he speaks, and will carry knowledge in his lips,' [Prov. xvi. 23. Sept. transl.] they also knew what they were saying. For if the prophets were wise, which we cannot deny—for Moses, 'learned in all wisdom,' [Acts vii. 22,] was accustomed to speak to the Lord, and the Lord answered him; and of Daniel, it is said to the prince of Tyre, 'Art thou wiser than Daniel?' [Ezek. xxviii. 3;] and David was wise, who, in the Psalm, exulted, 'Thou hast made known to me the doubtful and hidden things of thy wisdom' [Ps. li. 6, of the English version, according to the rendering of the Septuagint and Vulgate translations]—how were the wise prophets, LIKE BRUTE ANIMALS, igno-

[7] "Tertium genus visionis est secundum mentis intuitum, quo intellecta conspiciuntur veritas atque sapientia: sine quo genere illa duo quæ prius posui, vel infructuosa sunt, vel etiam in errorem mittunt . . . . . Non est propheta veri Dei et summi, qui oblita [oblata] divinitus visa, vel solo corpore vel etiam illa parte spiritûs videt qua corporum capiuntur imagines, et mente non videt."—Aug. Contr. Adimant. Ed. Bened. tom. viii. col. 149, 150.

rant of what they were saying? We read also in another passage of the apostle: 'The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets;' [1 Cor. xiv. 32;] so that they have it in their own power when to be silent and when to speak. And if this conclusion appears not well founded to any one, let him mark that saying of the same apostle, 'Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the others judge; but if any thing shall have been revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace.' [Ibid. ver. 29, 30.] How can they hold their peace if it is in the power of the spirit who speaks by the prophets, either to be silent or to speak? If therefore they understood what they said, the whole matter is full of wisdom and reason; nor did a mere noise come to their ears, but God spoke *in the mind of the prophets.*"[8]

And so in his Comment. on Isaiah, viii. 5—8, after explaining the *metaphorical* meaning of *wine* in this passage to be idolatry and false doctrine, he adds,—"Therefore the priests and prophets of the heretics lost their understanding through strong drink, and were overwhelmed by

[8] "Neque vero, ut Montanus cum insanis fœminis somniat, Prophetæ in ecstasi sunt loquuti, ut nescirent quid loquerentur; et quum alios erudirent, ipsi ignorarent quid dicerent. De quibus Apostolus ait: *Nescientes quæ loquantur, neque de quibus affirment:* [1 Tim. i. 7:] sed juxta Salomonem qui loquitur in Proverbiis, *Sapiens intelligit quæ profert de ore suo, et in labiis suis portabit scientiam,* [Prov. xvi. 23, sec. Sept.,] etiam ipsi sciebant quid dicerent. Si enim sapientes erant Prophetæ, quod negare non possumus; et Moses, omni eruditus sapientia, [Act. vii. 22,] loquebatur ad Dominum, et Dominus respondebat ei; et de Daniele ad principem Tyri dicitur: *Nunquid sapientior es Daniele?* [Ezech. xxviii. 3.] et David sapiens erat qui gloriabatur in Psalmo: *Incerta et occulta sapientiæ tuæ manifestasti mihi;* [Ps. l. 8. Vulg.—li. 6. Sept.—li. 6. Heb.] quomodo sapientes prophetæ, instar brutorum animantium, quid dicerent ignorabant? Legimus et in alio Apostoli loco: *Spiritus prophetarum prophetis subjecti sunt;* [1 Cor. xiv. 32;] ut in sua habeant potestate, quando taceant, quando loquantur. Quod si cui videtur infirmum: illud ejusmodi apostoli audiat: *prophetæ duo aut tres loquantur, et alii dijudicent: si autem alii fuerit revelatum sedenti, prior taceat.* [Ibid. vv. 29, 30.] Qua possunt ratione reticere, quum in ditione sit Spiritus qui loquitur per prophetas, vel tacere vel dicere? Si ergo intelligebant quæ dicebant, cuncta sapientiæ rationisque sunt plena: nec aer voce pulsatus ad aures eorum perveniebat, sed Deus loquebatur in animo prophetarum," &c. Hieronymi Præf. in Expos. Is.; Op. Ed. Bened. vol. iii. col. 5, 6.

wine, such as were Prisca and Maximilla and their chief Montanus, and knew not what they said . . . . Concerning such a vision of fancy, the apostle said, 'Giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy.' [1 Tim. iv. 1, 2.]" [9]

So also in his preface to his Commentary on Nahum, he says,—"Moreover this also is to be remarked, that this '*taking in hand*,' [assumtio,] or '*burden*,' or '*weight*,' [Nahum i. 1,] is a vision of the prophet. For he does not speak in an ecstasy, as Montanus and Prisca and Maximilla foolishly think; but his prophecy is a 'book of the vision' [Nahum i. 1] of one who understands every thing which he says, and makes the burden of their enemies a vision [i. e. exposes it to view] among his own people." [1]

Again, in his preface to his Exposition of Habakkuk, he says in like manner:—"And this also is to be observed, that the '*taking in hand*,' or '*burden*,' . . . is a vision of the prophet; and contrary to the mischievous doctrine of Montanus he understands what he sees, and does not speak like one mad, nor utter an unmeaning sound like insane women. Whence, also, the apostle exhorts, that if, when others are prophesying, any thing *shall have been* revealed to another, those who were before speaking should be silent. And immediately after says, 'For God is not

[9] "Igitur sacerdotes et prophetæ hæreticorum exciderunt mente propter siceram et absorpti sunt propter vinum, quales fuerunt Prisca et Maximilla, earumque princeps Montanus, et quid dicerent nesciebant . . . . . De hoc phasmate et apostolus loquebatur: *Attendentes spiritibus erroris et doctrinis dæmoniorum, in hypocrisi loquentium mendacium.* [1 Tim. iv. 1, 2.]" Expos. in Is. c. viii. vv. 5—8. vol. iii. col. 235, 6.

[1] "Simul et hoc attendendum, quod hæc ipsa vel *assumtio*,* vel *onus*, vel *pondus*, prophetæ visio sit. Non enim loquitur in εκστασει, ut Montanus et Prisca Maximillaque delirant: sed quod prophetat, liber est visionis intelligentis universa quæ loquitur; et pondus hostium facientis in suo populo visionem."—Prolog. in Expos. Naum. vol. iii. col. 1559, 60.

---

* From the Sept. transl. λημμα. This is also Theodotion's rendering, as may be seen in Orig. Hex. in Habak. i. 1, where Jerome has also rendered it by *assumtio*. Hence there is no reason for changing the common reading (λημμα) of Theodotion's translation of Gen. ii. 23, for προσλημμα, from Jerome's having there translated it by *assumtio*, as some have supposed.

the author of confusion, but of peace.' [1 Cor. xiv. 30, 33.] From which we perceive, when a person voluntarily holds his peace, and gives place to another to speak, that he is able both to speak and to be silent when he pleases. But he who speaks in an ecstasy, that is, involuntarily, neither has it in his own power to be silent, nor to speak."[2]

And so in other parts he speaks of "the mad prophetesses,"[3] Priscilla and Maximilla.

And in his Commentary on Ephes. iii. 5, he says,—"Either, therefore, this is to be understood according to Montanus, that the patriarchs and prophets spoke in ecstasy, and did not know what they said; or if this is impious, (inasmuch as the spirit of the prophets is subject to the prophets,) they understood what they uttered;" and then adds, that, among other ways of explaining the passage, this is one; "That Paul has not said precisely and generally that the mystery of the Lord was altogether unknown to other generations, but that the antient patriarchs and prophets were ignorant of it as respects the full extent in which it is now revealed to his saints and apostles. For it is one thing to have in the Spirit a knowledge of things to come, and another to see those things actually performed."[4]

Vincentius of Lerins, a. d. 434.

In his Admonition against heresies, he says, after paying

[2] "Necnon et hoc animadvertendum, quod assumtio vel pondus .... prophetæ visio est: et adversum Montani dogma perversum intelligit quod videt; nec ut amens loquitur, nec in morem insanientium feminarum dat sine mente sonum: unde et apostolus jubet, ut, si, prophetantibus aliis, alii fuerit revelatum, taceant qui prius loquebantur. Et statim: *Non est enim, inquit, Deus dissensionis sed pacis.* [1 Cor. xiv. 30, 33.] Ex quo intelligitur, quum quis voluntate reticet, et alteri locum dat ad loquendum, posse et loqui et tacere quum velit. Qui autem in ecstasi, id est, invitus, loquitur, nec tacere nec loqui in sua potestate habet."—Proleg. in Expos. Abacuc. vol. iii. col. 1591, 2.

[3] "Insanas vates." De viris illustribus sub "Apollinaris," c. xxvi. (vol. iv. pt. 2, col. iii.), et "Apollonius," c. 40, (col. 113.)

[4] "Aut igitur juxta Montanum, patriarchas et prophetas in extasi loquu-

a just tribute of admiration to the eloquence of Tertullian, —"This only will I mention, that by supporting, contrary to the precept of Moses, the strange furies of Montanus when rising up in the Church, and those insane dreams of new-fangled doctrine of insane women as true prophecies, he deserved, that of him also and his writings it should be said, 'If a prophet shall have arisen up in the midst of thee;' and presently after, 'Thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet.' Why? 'Because,' he says, 'the Lord your God proves you to know whether you love him or not.' [Deut. xiii. 1—3.]" [5]

Theodorit, A. D. 453.

"This man, [i. e. Montanus,] being incited by the love of bearing rule, called himself the Paraclete." [6]

Gregory the Great, A. D. 585.

In his commentary on Job, chap. xiii. 1, he says, "But words are of no use unless they are understood. Whence it is expressly added, 'and I have understood everything.' For when any thing is shown or heard, if the comprehension

tos accipiendum, et nescisse quæ dixerint; aut si hoc impium est (spiritus quippe prophetarum prophetis subjectus est), intellexerunt utique quæ loquuti sunt."—"Non definite et generaliter dixisse Paulum aliis generationibus ignotum fuisse omnino Domini sacramentum, sed sic quomodo nunc revelatum est sanctis ejus et apostolis, nescisse patriarchas veteres et prophetas. Aliud est enim in Spiritu ventura cognoscere; aliud ea cernere opere completa."—Hieron. Comm. in Ephes. iii. 5., vol. iv. p. 1, col. 349.

[5] "Hoc tantum commemorabo, quod contra Moysi præceptum exurgentes in Ecclesia novellas Montani furias et insana illa insanarum mulierum novitii dogmatis somnia veras prophetias asseverando, meruit ut de se quoque et scripturis suis diceretur: *Si surrexerit in medio tui Propheta.* Et mox: *Non audies verba Prophetæ illius.* Quare? *Quia,* inquit, *tentat vos Dominus Deus vester, utrum diligatis eum an non.* [Deut. xiii. vv. 1—3.]" Vincent. Lirinens. Commonit. adv. profanas omnium novitates hæreticorum. Ed. Baluz. cum Salviano, 1669, p. 346.

[6] Ὁυτος οιστρηθεις ερωτι φιλαρχιας Παρακλητον ἑαυτον προσηγορευσε.—Theodorit. Hæret. Fab. lib. iii. c. 2. Ed. Sirmond. et Garn. Lutet. Paris. 1642-84, vol. iv. p. 227.

of it is not given, it is by no means prophecy . . . When, therefore, the blessed Job bears witness that he has the spirit of prophecy, he asserts not only that he saw and heard, but also that he *understood* all."[7]

These testimonies are amply sufficient to demonstrate the sentiments of the primitive Church as to such prophets; and it is important here to notice, in connexion with our present subject, that their pretensions were united, at first, with general correctness of doctrine in other respects, and also, both then and subsequently, with remarkable strictness of discipline, and moreover sanctioned by the approval of some eminent persons whose *sincerity* is beyond suspicion, so that the sect lasted for a very considerable period of time.

They were united, at first, with general correctness of doctrine in other respects. We are assured by Jerome,[8] Theodorit,[9] and others,[1] that on the doctrines of the Trinity, and those respecting the person and work of Christ, (upon which most of the early heretics erred,) Montanus was quite orthodox. And this appears, also, from the silence upon this point, of those who first opposed him, who did so *on the sole ground of his having been deceived by a false spirit through his love of vain glory.* Moreover, the writings of Tertullian, who did not join the Montanist party till more than thirty years after its first appearance, afford a very strong proof that their errors, irrespective of that connected with their pretences to inspiration, were almost wholly confined to points relating to the discipline of the Church, in which they were desirous of introducing new and inexpedient austerities. Of the writings of Tertullian

[7] —" Sed utilitatem dicta non habent, si intellectu carent. Unde aperte subditur, *Et intellexi singula.* Cum enim aliquid ostenditur vel auditur, si intellectus non tribuitur, prophetia minime est. . . . . Ut igitur beatus Job prophetiæ spiritum se habere testetur, non solum vidisse se et audisse, sed etiam intellexisse, omnia, asserit."—Gregor. Magn. Expos. Moral. in Job. lib. ii. c. xii. in Jobi c. xiii. v. 1. (Ed. Rom. 1588. tom. ii. p. 572.)

[8] Epist. ad Marcell.

[9] Hæret. Fab. lib. 3. c. 2.

[1] See Epiphan. De Hæres. in hær. 48, and Philastrius De Hæres. in Hæres. sub apost. 2.

composed after he became a Montanist, many remain; some of which are expressly in defence of great Catholic truths, as for instance, his valuable work against Praxeas, in defence of the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, and others in defence of the Montanistic discipline but silent as to any other errors. In fact, he says expressly in one of these works;—"The rule of faith, indeed, is always and everywhere the same, alone constant and unalterable, namely, of believing in one only omnipotent God, the Creator of the world, and his Son Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, raised the third day from the dead, received into heaven, sitting now at the right hand of the Father, about to come to judge the quick and the dead, by the resurrection even of the flesh. While this rule of faith remains, other points, as of discipline and conduct, still admit correction, inasmuch as the grace of God is still at work, and making advances [in the good effects it produces] even to the end. For how can we suppose that when the devil is always at work, and adding daily to his devices for doing mischief, the work of God can have ceased, or ceased to advance? Since on that account God has sent the Paraclete, that, as human weakness could not receive the whole at once, discipline might by degrees be directed, and ordered, and led on to perfection by that vicegerent of the Lord, the Holy Spirit. 'I have yet,' he says, 'many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth.' [John xvi. 12, 13.] What, therefore, is the administration of the Paraclete but this, that discipline is arranged, that the Scriptures are revealed, that the understanding is set right, that an advance is made to a better state of things? . . . . . Righteousness, (for the same God is the God of righteousness, and of the creature,) was at first only in its beginnings when nature feared God; hence it proceeded through the law and the prophets to its infancy; hence through the gospel it advanced to the warmth of youth; now through the Paraclete it is settled into a state of maturity. He

alone, after Christ, must be called and revered as our master. For he does not speak from himself, but the things which are commanded him by Christ. He alone is our leader, because he is the only successor of Christ. They who have received him prefer truth to custom. They who have hearkened to him, as he is even now prophesying, veil their virgins. But at the same time I have no wish to reckon this custom the truth. Let it be considered only a custom." And then proceeding to observe that the apostolical churches generally followed the contrary custom, he adds,—"We cannot altogether cast out a custom which we cannot condemn, as being one which cannot be called a strange custom, for it is not that of strangers to us, but of those to whom we allow the right of peace and the name of brethren. *There is one faith to us and them*, one God, the same Christ, the same hope, the same baptismal sacraments. I could once have said, we are one church."[2]

[2] "Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem, mundi conditorem, et filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in cœlis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem. Hac lege fidei manente, cetera jam disciplinæ et conversationis admittunt novitatem correctionis, operante scilicet et proficiente usque in finem gratia Dei. Quale est enim, ut, diabolo semper operante et adjiciente quotidie ad iniquitatis ingenia, opus Dei aut cessaverit aut proficere destiterit? Cum propterea Paracletum miserit Dominus, ut quoniam humana mediocritatis [mediocritas] omnia semel capere non poterat, paulatim dirigeretur et ordinaretur et ad perfectum perduceretur disciplina ab illo vicario Domini Spiritu Sancto. Adhuc, inquit, multa habeo loqui vobis, sed, &c. [Joh. xvi. 12, 13.] Quæ est ergo Paracleti administratio nisi hæc, quod disciplina dirigitur, quod Scripturæ revelantur, quod intellectus reformatur, quod ad meliora proficitur? . . . . Justitia (nam idem Deus justitiæ et creaturæ) primo fuit in rudimentis, natura Deum metuens: dehinc per Legem et Prophetas promovit in infantiam: dehinc per Evangelium efferbuit in juventutem: nunc per Paracletum componitur in maturitatem. Hic erit solus a Christo magister et dicendus et verendus. Non enim ab se loquitur, sed quæ mandantur a Christo. Hic solus antecessor quia solus post Christum. Hunc qui receperunt, veritatem consuetudini anteponunt. Hunc qui audierunt, usque nunc non olim*

* Rigaltius considers the words "*non olim*" not to belong to the text of Tertullian. There is evidently some mistake here in the text. Perhaps Tertullian wrote "*jam olim*." The passage would then mean, "as he is still, and has been for some time, prophesying."

Such also is the opinion of Du Pin. "As to what relates [he says] to the rule of faith, that is to say, to the principal doctrines of religion, Tertullian and the first Montanists were of the same opinion with the church."—Eccl. Hist. vol. i. p. 96.

And from Tertullian particularly, as well as other sources, we find that they were distinguished by remarkable strictness of discipline. At the very outset, as we have seen, vice was openly rebuked, holiness enforced, and even individuals reproved in those terms of admonition which the subtile conjecture of man, and more especially of an evil spirit, could, without difficulty, make to appear most plausibly suitable.[3] This was afterwards followed up by various rules and regulations respecting the discipline of the church differing little more from that commonly received, than in the superior strictness of its requirements.[4] We have the same authority also, Tertullian, for saying, that, as it respected their principles *at least*, their morals were of the most unexceptionable kind. They enjoined the precepts of the gospel to the very letter. They were particularly diligent in works of charity, visiting and relieving the sick and the poor. And as the author in Eusebius tells us, many of them laid down their lives as martyrs for the faith. The reproach which they cast upon the Church, (already mentioned,) fully shows, indeed, the nature of their pretensions upon these points. They were accustomed to call the members of the Catholic Church animal

prophetantem, virgines contegunt. Sed nolo interim hunc morem veritati deputare. Consuetudo sit tantisper."——"Non possumus respuere consuetudinem quam damnare non possumus, utpote non extraneam, quia non extraneorum, cum quibus scilicet communicamus jus pacis et nomen fraternitatis. Una nobis et illis fides, unus Deus, idem Christus, eadem spes, eadem lavacri sacramenta. Semel dixerim, una Ecclesia sumus."—Tertull. De Virgin. veland. *init.* Op. Ed. Priorio, Lut. Paris. 1664, p. 173. See also De Jejun. c. i.; and De Monogam. c. ii.; and De Res. Carn. c. xi. and c. ult. quoted by Lardner.

[3] See account given by contemporary author quoted above.

[4] See Tertull. De Jejun., De Pudicit., and the other works written by Tertullian after he became a Montanist.

or natural men,[5] who *had not the Spirit*, while they assumed to themselves the title of spiritual persons.[6] Not that they seem hereby to have meant to deny their salvability, but to signify that they were but imperfect Christians, who had not attained that state of spirituality and enjoyment of the Spirit's influences which they themselves had. The spirit that spoke in them taught them to look upon those only as really enlightened and blessed who had joined their party, and to revile all who rejected them. Hence their condemnation by the Church rather *confirmed* them in their errors than otherwise.[7]

What more especially contributed to uphold the delusion was, that their pretensions were sanctioned by the approval of some eminent persons, whose *sincerity* is beyond suspicion. Of the *sincerity* of many of them, their martyrs are a sufficient proof. It appears, also, that their tenets were defended by a few persons of influence in the Church. From all these causes there was at first much doubt in the minds of some, as to the light in which their claims were to be regarded; and several churches were at the time thrown into a state of disquiet and confusion, from the difference of opinion that prevailed among their members on the subject, as we find particularly

[5] Ψυχικοι. [6] Πνευματικοι.

[7] The opinion of the learned Bishop of Lincoln (in his work quoted above, p. 112,) is, that "Montanus conceived himself to be inspired by the same Spirit as the apostles, thought it was his peculiar office to close as it were the Christian revelation, and to place in a clear and refulgent light those sublime truths, those doctrines of perfection, which, during Christ's residence upon earth, his disciples had not been able to bear; but which had been in a progressive state of developement since the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost." (p. 27.) And he adds (pp. 28, 29,) the following passage from Tertullian's Tract, "De Resurrectione Carnis," (sub fin.) in proof of this opinion: "The Holy Spirit, having previously allowed some doctrines to remain involved in a certain degree of obscurity in order to prove the faith of Christians, had now removed all ambiguities by a clear and explicit developement of the whole mystery of the Gospel, through the new prophecy which had been poured out abundantly from the Paraclete." The strictness of their discipline, and their regard for external holiness, at least, are shown at length by Lardner, l. c. Sect. 8.

mentioned by the contemporary author in Eusebius, respecting the church of Ancyra in Galatia.

Nor was the party ultimately formed in their favour, though small, of short duration. Two of their most celebrated defenders joined them about thirty-five years after their first appearance. These were Proculus or Proclus, and one who was, till then, looked up to as one of the most valuable members and ornaments of the Church, viz. Tertullian.

The former is called by Tertullian, "the ornament of a virgin old age and of Christian eloquence."[8] He maintained a public disputation at Rome on this subject with the eloquent Caius, which is quoted and alluded to several times by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History.[9] He is also said by Tertullian to have written a noble work against the Valentinians.[1] The notices thus left of him evidently show that both his learning and general character were such as to give him considerable weight.

But by far the most important acquisition to their cause was Tertullian, of whom all unite in speaking with respect for his learning and eloquence, while they lament that uncontrolled fervor of mind that led him to credit the reveries of Montanus and his followers. His character and writings are too well known to need particular notice here, and have been so frequently discussed, that it is sufficient to refer to any of the accounts respecting him, to satisfy the reader that his testimony on this subject was that of an eloquent, sincere, and pious man. But, as Jerome tells us, he was "of a hot and vehement disposition."[2] His character is thus described by Du Pin;—"He was of a very quick, sprightly, and sharp temper, but he had not all that *exactness* and *clearness* that might have been wished. *There is very often more glittering than solidity in his reasonings. He rather strikes and dazzles by his bold expressions, than*

[8] Tertull. Adv. Valentin. c. 3.

[9] Lib. iii. c. 31; lib. ii. c. 25; lib. iii. c. 28; and lib. vi. c. 20.

[1] Adv. Val. c. 3.

[2] "Acris et vehementis ingenii." Hieron. De vir. illustr. c. 53. See also his Epist. ad Magn.

convinces by the force of his arguments. His thoughts are far fetched, and sometimes lofty enough; the turn which he gives them is high, but not very natural. He oftentimes stretches things too far. He is warm and transported almost upon every thing. He is full of figures and hyperboles . . . If he does not persuade by his reasonings, he at least forces consent by that pompous way of expression whereby he sets them out," &c.[3] His fall into Montanism was deeply lamented by the Church, and is an important proof how far the most talented and sincere may be misled, especially when subject to the influence of a fervid imagination and an impetuous mind.

Tertullian was far beyond all comparison the chief of the party; but the sect lasted, though apparently in very small numbers, for two centuries after his time.[4]

It is also worthy of observation, as characteristic of such claims, that the Montanists seem to have rested chiefly on their own testimony as the evidence of their being inspired. They who rejected them were immediately accused as persons who rejected the Holy Spirit, simply because they rejected those, who, while they appeared, and, perhaps, were, sincere and virtuous, *deemed themselves* to be so inspired. The Montanists found fault with the Church, as Epiphanius tells us, for not at once *receiving the gifts*, and considered its members guilty of resisting God and quenching the Spirit.

The reader, then, has it now in his power, without difficulty, to form a judgment of the character of the Montanistic prophets, and also the opinions of the Fathers respecting the nature and merits of their claims; and *shall decide for himself how far their case is similar to that now under consideration.*

[3] Du Pin's Eccl. Hist. (Engl. transl.) vol. i. pp. 96, 7.

[4] "This people subsisted a good while, for the Cataphrygians are expressly mentioned in Constantine's Edicts against heretics. Epiphanius says, (H. 48, n. 14,) they were then in Cappadocia, Galatia, and Phrygia, and numerous in Cilicia and at Constantinople. Augustine, (De hær. c. 26,) and Sozomen, (l. 7, c. 18,) and Theodoret, (H. Fab. l. 3, c. 2,) speak of them as in being in their times. A Montanist endeavoured to pervert Marcella, to whom Jerome (Ep. 27. Ad. Marc.) writes."—*Lardner.*

Much more might have been added from the works of the early Fathers respecting the Montanists, did it not appear to the writer that what has been given is amply sufficient to show the real nature of their pretensions to the prophetic character, and the opinion of the Church respecting them, which are the only two points that concern our present subject.

It may be worth while here to observe, that a great part of the work called "The General Delusion of Christians," &c., written originally with some reference to the French and English prophets, in 1713, and lately republished in defence of the present claimants, by *one of their most staunch supporters*, is taken up with an attempt to prove, "that the spirit condemned by some churches, under the name of Montanism, was the true spirit of prophecy." Its author allows the characteristics of this pretended manifestation of the Spirit to have been such as they have been here described, but resolutely defends them; (see particularly pp. 284—6;) and what is most extraordinary, (and would have been *utterly impossible* had he consulted the writings of the Fathers on the subject,) attempts to prove, that the condemnation of the Montanists, for the first thirty or forty years, was confined to comparatively a small party in the Church. (See pp. 299, &c.) It is evident, however, that he was unequal to the task he undertook, for he was *confessedly* unacquainted with the Fathers himself, so as not even to verify the references to them he found in other authors,[5] and therefore takes every thing at second or third hand. And hence his whole discussion rests on unauthorized statements, often most dogmatically made, and loose appeals to great names, as sanctioning particular views, without any references enabling the reader to verify the assertion.

A similar defect of references much diminishes the value of the Treatise on Montanism, written by a Mr. Lee, and published by Dr. Hicks in 1709, from which the author of "The General Delusion" quotes somewhat largely, though

[5] See his work, pp. 162, 3; 176; 197, 8; and 232, 3.

in the main point Mr. Lee takes the opposite view of the Montanistic prophets. Both agree in vindicating their *general* correctness in fundamental doctrines, and in rescuing their moral character from the charges which some of their opponents made against them; and in this the writer is convinced that their testimony is true, and will be found agreeable to the opinions of the majority, at least, of the best writers, antient and modern;[6] but in the matter of their pretended inspirations the whole stream of writers and evidence on the subject is against the author of "The General Delusion."

The great importance of this case in the present question, has induced me to give this full account of it, and of the sentiments of the Fathers respecting it; for such is the similarity between the Montanistic mode of prophesying and that of the persons whose case we are considering, that if it were true, as is attempted to be proved, that the spirit of Montanism was "the true spirit of prophecy," and condemned by a comparatively small party in the church, it would afford a strong argument in favour of the claims of Mr. Irving's followers; while, on the contrary, if it be proved that it was a spirit of delusion, and condemned as such by almost the whole Christian church at that very early period, it affords the very strongest argument, excepting scriptural testimony, against them.

I now pass on to notice, in the next chapter, other similar pretensions which have been set up in the Church at subsequent periods of its history.

[6] This is quite the opinion of Lardner.—See his Hist. of Her., Art. on Montanists. Sect. 4, 5, and 9.

CHAPTER IV.

VARIOUS SIMILAR CASES SINCE THE MONTANISTS.

The example of the Montanists has been followed by many others who have sprung up at various times in the Christian Church. In the following examples I confine myself, with one exception, to the cases of persons to all appearance sincere and pious. I just mention, however, in the first instance, a remarkable case, that occurred in the third century, of a contrary description, to show, even to those who are most disposed to forget it, that truth, that Satan may be permitted to deceive the Church in the garb of "an angel of light," "with all power and signs." The case to which I allude is mentioned by Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, in his letter to Cyprian.

"I will tell you," he says, "of a circumstance which happened among us, and is connected with this subject. Nearly two-and-twenty years ago, just after the reign of the Emperor Alexander, many calamities happened here, either affecting all men generally, or in particular the Christians; there were also many and frequent earthquakes. . . When the faithful, then, were in the midst of this trouble, ... there suddenly sprung up here a certain woman, who had fits of ecstasy, and gave herself out to be a prophetess, and acted so under the pretence of being inspired by the Holy Spirit. And she was so carried on by the impulse of some of the most powerful evil spirits, that for a long time she disturbed and deceived the brethren, and,

performing many wonderful and strange things, promised that she would even cause an earthquake. Not that the devil could have sufficient power to be able, by his command, to produce an earthquake, or cause a vibration of the air, but that sometimes that artful spirit, foreseeing and understanding that an earthquake is about to happen, might pretend that he would produce that which he saw would happen. And by these falsehoods and boasts he had captivated the minds of various individuals, so that they were ready to obey him, and to follow him whithersoever he might order and lead them; and he would make that woman walk with naked feet over the frozen snow in a severe winter, without being at all troubled or injured by it; he used to give out, also, that he was hastening back to Judea and Jerusalem, pretending that he had come from thence. He also deceived a country-presbyter, and another likewise, a deacon, so that they sinned[1] with that woman, which was shortly after discovered. For suddenly there appeared against him one of the exorcists, a man of established character, and of exemplary morals, who was roused by the exhortation of many of the brethren who stood fast and sound in the faith, and stood up to oppose and refute that wicked spirit, who, with subtile deceit, had even predicted, a little before, that an enemy was about to rise up, an unbeliever who would try them with his temptations. That exorcist, however, filled with the grace of God, withstood him boldly, and proved that he who was before thought holy, was a most wicked spirit. But that woman, who, through the arts and frauds of the devil, was in the habit before of attempting many things to deceive the faithful, among other things, by which she had deceived many, frequently presumed so far as to pretend to consecrate the bread, and celebrate the eucharist, with an appropriate and decorous invocation, and to offer sacrifice to the Lord with the usual solemn rites and form of words. She would also baptize many, using the accustomed and proper forms of interrogation, that she might seem to differ

[1] Committed fornication.

in nothing from the rule of the Church."[2] This, indeed, is the case of one whom some of the attendant circumstances, as we have seen, prove to have been an impostor, but still we may learn from it not a little of the devices and the *power* of Satan to deceive the followers of Christ.

Coming down to more modern times, we may just glance at the case of the famous Elizabeth Barton, commonly called the Holy Maid of Kent, about the year 1533. Her prophecies were in like manner uttered under the influence of violent agitations, and a state of ecstasy, in which she was accustomed to break out into devout ejaculations,

[2] "Volo autem vobis et de historia quæ apud nos facta est exponere ad hoc ipsum pertinente. Ante viginti enim et duos fere annos temporibus post Alexandrum Imperatorem, multæ istic conflictationes et pressuræ acciderunt, vel in commune omnibus hominibus, vel privatim Christianis; terræ etiam motus plurimi et frequentes extiterunt .... In hac autem perturbatione constitutis fidelibus ... emersit istic subito quædam mulier, quæ in extasi constituta propheten se præferret, et quasi Sancto Spiritu plena sic ageret. Ita autem principalium dæmoniorum impetu ferebatur, ut per longum tempus sollicitaret et deciperet fraternitatem, ac mirabilia quædam et portentosa perficiens, et facere se terram moveri polliceretur. Non quod dæmoni tanta esset potestas, aut [ut] terram movere aut elementum concutere jussu valeret; sed quod nonnunquam spiritus nequam præsciens et intelligens terræ motum futurum, id se facturum esse simularet quod futurum videret. Quibus mendaciis et jactationibus subegerat mentem singulorum, ut sibi obedirent, et quocunque præciperet et duceret sequerentur; faceret quoque mulierem illam cruda hyeme nudis pedibus per asperas nives ire, nec vexari in aliquo aut lædi illa discursione: diceret etiam se in Judæam et Hierosolymam festinare, fingens tanquam inde venisset. Hic et unum de presbyteris rusticum, item et alium diaconum fefellit, ut eidem mulieri commiscerentur, quod paulo post detectum est. Nam subito apparuit illi unus de exorcistis, vir probatus et circa religiosam disciplinam bene semper conversatus, qui exhortatione quoque fratrum plurimorum, qui et ipsi fortes ac laudabiles in fide aderant, excitatus, erexit se contra illum spiritum nequam revincendum; qui subtili fallacia etiam hoc paulo ante prædixerat, venturum quendam aversum et tentatorem infidelem. Tamen ille exorcista inspiratus Dei gratia fortiter restitit, et esse illum nequissimum spiritum qui prius sanctus putabatur, ostendit. Atqui illa mulier quæ prius per præstigias et fallacias dæmonis multa ad deceptionem fidelium moliebatur, inter cetera quibus plurimos deceperat, etiam hoc frequenter ausa est, ut et invocatione non contemtibili sanctificare se panem et eucharistiam facere simularet, et sacrificium Domino non sine sacramento solitæ prædicationis offerret; baptizaret quoque multos usitata et legitima verba interrogationis usurpans, ut nil discrepare ab Ecclesiastica regula videretur."—Firmil. Ep. ad Cypr. apud Cypr. Epist. LXXV. Ed. Fell. Oxon. 1682, P. 2, pp. 222, 3.

declaim against the wickedness of the times, and denounce judgments upon the land. And though it seems probable that she was afterwards made a political tool by some designing priests about her, yet this does not appear to have been the case at first, and it is evident from her saying, at the time of her execution, that she was *made to believe* that she spoke by supernatural direction, that she was herself deceived. It is quite certain that her character was unimpeachable, except in this one point of pretending to be a prophetess, which she appears to have done with sincerity; and not only unimpeachable, but bearing upon it all the marks, and *generally believed to be*, of remarkable holiness. And the case is the more to be observed, from the circumstance of Archbishop Cranmer himself having credited her pretensions, and considered her to be divinely inspired, not to mention those who might have a political bias to induce them to do so, viz. Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher.[3]

I mention the case merely as an instance of false prophecy delivered in a state of ecstasy, and connected with apparent sincerity and holiness.

Very similar to this was the case of Thomas Munzer, Nicholas Stork, and others, commonly called the Celestial Prophets, who appeared in Germany about the year 1520, just at the time when the Reformation was commenced by Luther. Much has been written in various works respecting them; but as it is painful to dwell longer than is necessary upon such examples, I shall content myself with a few extracts from Milner, sufficient to show the general character of their pretensions, and the judgment of the great Reformer upon them. These men, who pretended to dreams and revelations from God, appeared to have produced at first a strong impression upon many of the chiefs of the reforming party, making their appearance while Luther was in his place of concealment. Melancthon, in a letter to the Elector of Saxony, says of them, "'I see strong reasons for

[3] See the English Ecclesiastical Historians; Sanders de Schismate Anglicano, &c.

not despising the men; for it is clear to me there is in them something more than a mere human spirit; but whether the spirit be of God or not, none except Martin can easily judge.'" "The Elector called in the advice of some of his most learned counsellors. These could come to no decision. They felt the same doubt which Melancthon had expressed, *and were afraid of sinning against God by condemning his choicest servants.*" The Elector considered it "a most weighty and difficult case." Their pretensions were, therefore, at this time, at least, borne out by all the appearances of sincerity and piety. We have no reason, indeed, to suppose that they were not sincere, especially as one of them afterwards recanted. Now mark the following observations of Luther, in reply to Melancthon's application. "'As you are my superior, both in discernment and erudition, I cannot commend your timidity in regard to these prophets. In the first place, *when they bear record of themselves, we ought not implicitly to believe them;* but rather to try the spirits, according to St. John's advice. *As yet I hear of nothing done or said by them which exceeds the imitative powers of Satan.* It is my particular wish that you would examine whether they can produce any PROOF of having a divine commission. For God never sent any prophet who was not either called by proper persons, or authorized by special miracles, no, not even his own Son. Their bare assertion of a divine afflatus is not a sufficient ground for your receiving them.'" When he appeared again in public, he held a conference with some of them. He there "patiently heard the prophet relate his visions; and when the harangue was finished, recollecting that nonsense was incapable of confutation, he briefly admonished him to take care what he did. You have mentioned, said he, nothing that has the least support in Scripture; the whole seems rather an ebullition of imagination, or perhaps the fraudulent suggestion of an evil spirit;" upon which one of them, as others have since done in similar circumstances, "expressed the most lively resentment that Luther should dare to say such things of

so divine a personage."—It is curious to observe the old Montanistic charge of want of *spirituality* in their opposers revived by Munzer. "'The doctrine of Luther, he said in his letter to Melancthon, was *not sufficiently spiritual;* it was, indeed, altogether carnal. Divines should exert their utmost endeavours to acquire *a spirit of prophecy*, otherwise their knowledge of divinity would not be worth one halfpenny. *They should consider their God as at hand, and not far off.*'" As the party of these prophets, however, appeared to increase, Luther addressed the Elector of Saxony on the matter. In this letter he still further develops his views on the subject of such pretensions. "'It is Satan's method, [he says,] to attempt to crush every revival of the Divine word, first by force, and if that does not succeed, then by false spirits, by artful and mischievous teachers. It was so in the first ages of the propagation of the gospel. He deluged Christendom with the blood of the martyrs. But this did not answer his purpose. He therefore sent forth a tribe of false prophets, and filled every corner of the world with heresies, till at length the papacy, that most powerful of all the anti-christs, fully completed his designs. It is so at this very time . . . They reckon little of our teaching faith, charity, and the cross, at Wittemberg. '*You must hear*, say they, *the voice of God itself.*' . . . . . They look on me as a lifeless Christian, and as one who never was favoured with hearing a voice from heaven. But in the name of every thing that is good, suppose I had acted in this manner when I was called before the papists, what triumphs should I have afforded them! . . I stood forward in a very critical and dangerous moment, as a public disputant at Leipsic. . . .Yet I made no pretence of hearing voices from heaven, or of being possessed of supernatural talents, or of having any thing of that spirit which has appeared at Alsted . . . *A just application of the Divine word in the production of true faith, is the only way to correct all bad practices.* . . . . The true method of expelling Satan and ruining his devices, is that of the New Testament, namely, the exer-

cise of preaching the word of God. *This lays hold of the heart, and cures the evil radically.*'" In 1525 he published a treatise against these prophets, who soon stamped upon themselves the evident and unquestionable seal of delusion, by attempting to propagate their tenets by force of arms, and rising against the civil power under which God had placed them, to establish their own religious system.[4]

The following is related by Casaubon, from a book containing several such accounts.[5] "In the same book, [he says,] there is another relation of an ecstatical maid in Friburg, in Misnia . . . . with the judgment of Paulus Eberus, a Lutheran divine, a man of great fame in those days. It doth not appear that this maid had any discoverable epilepsy at all, but began at the very first with ecstasies and visions. After her fits, she was full of religious discourse, most in the nature of sermons and godly exhortations; so that she was generally apprehended to be inspired, and her speeches were published in print, under the name of 'Divine Prophecies and Warnings.' Paulus Eberus was much against it; and though he durst not, against the public voice, affirm, that there was nothing of God's Spirit in all that she said; yet, in effect, he doth plainly enough declare his judgment to be, that . . . her ecstasies were epileptical fits, but of a more gentle and remiss kind of epilepsy than is ordinary; and as for her *godly speeches*, that they were the effects of a *godly education*, *frequent hearing of the word*, *intent and assiduous meditation*, and the like; which it seems, upon diligent inquiry, he had found to be her case. This happened in the year of the Lord, 1560."[6]

We have a curious account given us by Nider, of a youth in Germany, whom he makes no scruple at once to call

[4] Milner's Hist. of Church of Christ, vol. v. pp. 44—48, 70, 71, and 204—210. See also, Seckendorfii Comment. Histor. de Lutheranismo; Sleidani De statu relig. Carolo V. Cæsare Comment.; Camerarii Vita P. Melancthonis, &c. &c.

[5] Pauli Lentuli Historia Apolloniæ Schreieræ, &c. Bern. 1604, 4to.

[6] Meric Casaubon's Treatise on Enthusiasm, 2d. edit. 1656, p. 96.

possessed. "A youth, [he says,] that was possessed, began to have certain devotional gestures in prayer. His brethren observed him to be in a state of abstraction and to be deprived of all the external senses of the body. And when these were restored, he spoke well in Latin, which he was before ignorant of. He delivered from memory many passages of the Bible which were before unknown to him. He spoke the French language, which he had never learnt. He asserted that he had seen wonderful things in heaven; and delivering some of his revelations, he presumed to speak of wonderful things. From which some women, who are credulous and easily deceived, thought for certain that the Divine Spirit was present with him, when the devil only had place in him."[7]

We may also notice the case of the Ursaline prophetesses, who, it is said, appeared in France about the year 1640, and who "had strange agitations, and under them delivered wonderful things. Their heads moved backward and forward with wonderful quickness, and a *voice sounded out of their breasts like the yelping of a dog*. And what is further remarkable is, that at the end of their agitations they seemed to suffer nothing, and their countenance recovered in an instant its natural form."[8]

Such instances of delusion might be multiplied to almost any extent, and it is remarkable, that not only have there been in all such cases some learned and pious men whose minds have been exercised with temporary doubts on the subject, but in almost all of them, some one or more such, who have openly and warmly espoused their cause.

[7] "Obsessus juvenis gestus quosdam cepit habere devotos in orationibus. Rapi eum fratres viderunt et privari omnibus exterioribus sensibus corporis. Quibus restitutis locutus est bene Latine quod prius nescivit. Cordetenus protulit multos Bibliorum passus qui eum prius latebant. Gallicam linguam expressit quam nunquam didicerat. Se in cœlo mirabilia vidisse asseruit. Revelationesque quasdam exprimendo mirabilia dicere præsumpsit. Ex quibus nonnullæ fœminæ, quæ cito credunt et leves sunt corde, certo putarunt adesse Divinum Spiritum ubi diabolus solum locum habebat." Nideri De Visionibus et Revelat. lib. 3, c. 1.

[8] Charles Owen's "The Scene of Delusions opened." Lond. 1712, 12mo. p. 124.

A remarkable case of the kind is mentioned by Joseph a Costa,[9] and repeated from him by Del Rio,[1] and Casaubon,[2] as happening about the end of the sixteenth century, in which a theologian, high in esteem for his learning and piety, and "almost, at that time, the wonder of that part of the world,"[3] (America,) was completely deceived and misled by a woman who pretended to inspirations received in a state of ecstasy. Another example occurs also in the case of the famous Magdalene de la Cruz, of Cordova, who in the same way imposed upon many; an account of whom is given, as Del Rio informs us, by Ribadeneira,[4] and Horozæus:[5] and many others are to be found in other writers.[6] No age of the world, in fact, has been without them.

Not, however, to multiply such cases unnecessarily, I will describe only one or two that are so remarkably similar to that which has lately occurred among us, as to be worth considering in their principal features; especially as the full accounts which are extant respecting them, enable us to take a more general and complete view of their nature and characteristics than it is possible to do in most cases of this kind. Such claims have generally sunk speedily into oblivion, without leaving behind them even a full record of the facts; an oblivion intrinsically well deserved, and on some accounts desirable, but which unfortunately produces this effect, that, whenever they recur, they appear with all the charms of singularity and novelty. The first of these cases occurred about the middle of the seventeenth century, and had for its principal defender the excellent John Amos Comenius, a bishop of the church of the United Brethren,

[9] De Noviss. temp. lib. 2, c. 11.

[1] Disquisit. Magic. lib. 4, c. 1. quest. 3, § 3.

[2] On Enthusiasm, ed. 1656, pp. 102—106.

[3] "Pene tunc hujus orbis miraculum." A Costa.

[4] Vita Ignat. Loyol. lib. 5, c. 10.

[5] De vera et falsa prophetia, lib. 1, c. 24.

[6] See F. Hutchinson's Short View of the pretended Spirit of Prophecy. Lond. 1708. 8vo. ch. 3. Dr. H. More's Mystery of Godliness. Lond. 1660. fol., &c. &c.

of whom it is gratifying to be able to record that he lived to see and *acknowledge* his error. These prophetic pretenders were Christopher Kotter, Christina Poniatowsky, and Nicholas Drabicius, of whom and their prophecies an account was published by Comenius, from which the following facts are taken, except where any other authority is mentioned.[7]

These prophecies, as a valuable author observes in a work written not long after, were "tendered to the world by men of no common name, and with a confidence, I think, beyond the examples of history."[8] They related chiefly to the speedy fall of all anti-christian tyranny, accompanied by awful judgments upon the ungodly, and the establishment of the Church of Christ in great glory throughout the earth,[9] with *apparently* some occasional warnings of the near approach of Christ to reign upon earth.[1]

They were delivered by these supposed prophets *while in* a state of what they called ecstasy, professedly as the passive organs of utterance to a superior power, under involuntary agitations of body, and often apparently with unconsciousness of mind. In these ecstasies they sometimes had visions which formed part of the revelation.[2]

In the year 1625, Comenius was travelling as one of a deputation from the United Brethren in Moravia, to some of their brethren in Poland, and on his journey was informed of some remarkable prophecies of one Christopher Kotter, a pious man, an inhabitant of Sprottau in Silesia, a town through which he passed, which were accredited to

[7] Historia Revelationum Christoph. Kotteri, Christin. Poniatoviæ, Nicolai Drabicii, et quæ circa illas varie acciderunt, &c. [no place,] 1659, 4to. In the preface to this, he says he had printed their prophecies *for private distribution*, under the title of "Lux in tenebris," in 1657. In 1663, he published a small tract in 4to, entitled "Continuatio historiæ revel. Nic. Drabicii."

[8] Spencer in his Treatise concerning Vulgar Prophecies, p. 6, subjoined to his Discourse concerning Prodigies. 2d edition, 1665.

[9] Histor. Revel. pp. 16; 26; 29; 75; 76; 79, 80; 95—98; 112; 129, 130; &c. &c.

[1] See Histor. Revel. pp. 79 and 112.

[2] Histor. Revel. *passim*, and see pp. 74; 191, 192; 251.

him by the high approval of Mencelius, the Moravian pastor of Sprottau, and other Christian friends, with whom Kotter was a frequent visitant.[3] On his way back, he again pays a visit to Mencelius, and translates the prophecies into Bohemian, during which occupation he says he cannot but mention, to the praise of God, *what delightful emotions his mind experienced.*[4] The rest of his time was spent most delightfully in pious conversation, so that he seemed to himself to have passed hardly any part of his life *more holily.*[5] "I can with truth," he says, "bear witness, to the praise of God, that I never in my life experienced a sweeter foretaste of eternal life, and what joys that perfect communion of saints will bring, than here. And this leads me to mention briefly how truly worthy of a divine was the life that holy man Mencelius lived. Every thing at his house exhibited a beautiful propriety . . . . He had a mother-in-law with him. . . a truly pious woman, a living exemplar of all virtues. *The conversation at his table was only on religious subjects, to mutual edification . . . . In a word, I neither saw or was conscious of any thing there that was not pious and holy.*[6] He afterwards consulted an aged and celebrated divine, Christopher Pelargus, on the subject of Kotter's prophecies, who told him that after having in vain consulted his books on the subject, he "betook himself to prayer, and fervently called upon God, *often*

[3] Pp. 16—18.

[4] "Non possum non memorare Deo in laudem quantis suavitatibus per eos dies pastus fuerit animus meus." p. 18.

[5] "Quicquid a suscepto labore superesse poterat temporis in colloquia pia suavissime impendebatur; ut vix ullam vitæ partem sanctius transegisse mihi videar." p. 18.

[6] "Possum cum veritate Deo in laudem testari, nunquam in vita mea me suaviorem vitæ æternæ prægustum et quæ perfecta illa sanctorum consociatio gaudia secum allatura sit sensisse atque hic. Qua occasione paucis, quam vere theologicam vitam egerit sanctus ille vir Mencelius attingam. Ordinis decori omnia domi ejus plena erant. . . . Socrum etiam secum habuit . . . . fæminam vere sanctam, omnium virtutum exemplar vivum. . . . Ad mensam si quid sermonum fuit, tantum de rebus piis ad mutuam ædificationem fuit. . . . . Verbo nihil ibi non pium et sanctum vidi aut expertus sum." pp. 18, 19.

rising in the night, and throwing himself upon his face, entreating him that he would not suffer his Church to be deceived; and that after all his meditations and divine suggestions, he had nothing else to say than that God had sent his angel to tell his servants those things which were shortly to come to pass."[7] (Alluding to Rev. xxi. 6.)

Unfortunately, however, for the credit of the prophet, they did not come to pass, and therefore it is unnecessary to repeat them here; but who will deny the sincerity and piety, and learning, of those who believed them? In 1627 Kotter was banished his country as a false prophet.[8]

Kotter was soon followed by Christina Poniatowsky, who in the year 1627 began to experience ecstasies and extraordinary visions and revelations.[9] She had been taught, says Comenius, from her infancy, by a pious education, to abhor all appearance of evil, and had lived an innocent and pious life; *was very far removed in her mind from superstition; had never been in the habit of reading fabulous revelations; and was of a cheerful disposition*, &c.[1] She is stated by him to have been the subject of *several remarkable miracles*, to which of course he refers as indubitable proofs of her divine mission; one of which was sudden recovery in one of her ecstasies from a state of lameness, such that she could not stand for six weeks, and another, (most positively asserted and attested by good witnesses,) *resurrection from a state of death.*[2] "In these visions," he says, "I admired her singing of psalms, her *recollection of the sacred Scriptures*, her *recitation of entire passages* on the most important articles of our faith, viz. on the merits of Christ, and our sanctification by his blood, &c.; and *the passages of Scripture were so aptly accommodated to the subject treated of, that the most experienced*

[7] "Ego igitur ad preces conversus, ardentissime invocabam Deum (sæpe etiam noctu surgens et me in faciem provolvens) ut ne pateretur illudi Ecclesiæ suæ orans. Post omnia vero tandem pensitata divinitusque suggesta non aliud habeo quod dicam nisi Deum misisse angelum suum qui nuntiaret nobis servis suis ea quæ oportet fieri cito." pp. 21, 22.

[8] P. 28. [9] P. 33. [1] Pp. 53, 4.

[2] Pp. 49, 50; 55, 56; 123—7.

theologian could scarcely have done it more pertinently." And who, he adds, does not perceive here divine power? &c.[3] He also notices, as a proof of her divine commission, the great desire she seemed to have for *perpetual union and communion with Christ*, evinced by her often breaking out in her ecstasies into expressions like these, "Come, come quickly, Lord Jesus. Take me to thyself, take me, I beseech thee; delay not. I am most ready to depart with thee with a willing and joyful mind. Dwell with me."[4] These revelations lasted till the beginning of 1629, when they ceased upon her so-called resurrection after a temporary state of death. While they lasted they were very frequent, and appear to have been collected with care by Comenius, and contain, together with other warnings and instructions, many prophecies, both religious and political, of changes that were soon to take place, but which, it is unnecessary to add, were abundantly contradicted by the course of events. *The diversity of opinion respecting her at the time, even among the learned and pious, is fully shown by the fact that at a synodal meeting of the brethren to the number of fifty, held February* 1629, *after much prayer and deliberation, it was found that opinions were so divided, that it was thought most advisable to enjoin silence respecting the matter, lest the church should be torn by disputes.*[5]

In 1632 she was married, with the consent, and in the presence, of a synod of the brethren, to Daniel Vetter, afterwards one of their bishops, and died in 1644.[6] The complete infatuation of Comenius and her followers respecting her and her prophecies, for a time, may be seen in almost every page of the account; and not the least in the following remark, called forth by the observations made by many when, in 1632, the two princes, whom she had designated

[3] P. 58. This is *exactly* what has been said of some of the present pretenders to the prophetic character.

[4] "Veni, veni cito Domine Jesu! Assume me tecum, assume, quæso; ne differas! Libenti et hilari animo tecum abire sum paratissima. Mane mecum." See pp. 61—2.

[5] Pp, 126—8.

[6] Ib. pp. 130, and 133, 4; and Cranz's Hist. of the United Brethren, pp. 71, 2.

as the great agents in the accomplishment of her predictions, died. "The rash insults," he observes, "of some persons upon this extraordinary and truly admirable work of God, so often repeated, made us more timid, especially when we saw the predicted events deferred from year to year. Yet, inasmuch as we were certain that there was nothing of fraud in it, human or diabolical, and that these things were of necessity to be referred to God as their author, who can neither deceive nor be deceived, and has reasons for executing his words and acts in one way or another, to us for the most part unknown, we have considered it right that these things should be religiously preserved, either for our own use or that of posterity."[7]

To Christina Poniatowsky succeeded Nicholas Drabicius, a minister of the United Brethren, whose alleged revelations were of the same kind, and made in the same way. The report of them was received by Comenius with hesitation, and with much prayer for Divine direction and guidance respecting them.[8] He was, probably, more cautious at first in admitting them, from the circumstance of Drabicius having, at one time, on account of some irregularity of conduct, fallen under the censures of the brethren, which, however, appeared to have had the desired effect upon him. After some consideration, Comenius was induced to admit his claims, and published his revelations, as he called them, in 1657, with those of the two former, as mentioned above. And in this his opinion concerning them, many other learned and pious men concurred, whose sentiments he gives in their own words.[9] And although he appears, in 1658, to have had some misgivings respecting the alleged

[7] "Temerarii illi quorundam in hoc extraordinarium, vereque admirabile Dei opus, toties repetiti insultus fecerunt nos timidiores, præsertim quum prædictos eventus de anno in annum differri videremus. Quia tamen fraudis in illo (humanæ aut diabolicæ) nihil intercessisse, necessarioque hæc ad Deum authorem referenda (qui nec fallere nec falli potest, suorumque dictorum t factorum sic vel sic administrandorum causas, nobis plerumque non intellectas, habet) certi fuimus, asservanda hæc putavimus religiose seu nostrum seu posteritatis in usum;" p. 132. See pp. 131—3.

[8] Ibid. pp. 143, 4, and 240.

[9] Ib. pp. 188—193.

inspirations of Drabicius from various causes,[1] yet it is evident from his own testimony in this account, published in 1659, that he had satisfied his doubts respecting them, not only from the fact of his then republishing them, but from what he says in p. 250; "I hope it is clear," he observes, "thirdly, that not one of us who are admirers of these prophecies, and have admitted them to be extraordinary divine admonitions, have used precipitancy or lightness; but because being convinced by the truth of the things, and the interposition of divine signs, we have seen that these things were done by the help of good spirits."[2] And in the preface, also, he states *in terms* his conviction that the effusions of all the three were "divine;"[3] and *that*, after he and his brethren had "betaken themselves to God by private and public prayers and fastings, and consulted the opinions of pious divines."[4]

As a specimen of *the language* of these supposed prophets in their effusions, I quote the following two or three passages, taken indiscriminately from those of Drabicius.

"Blessed are all ye who are looking for the revelation of my glory; for ye shall then be wonderfully preserved when my wrath shall be poured out."[5]

"Fear not, my servant, fear not any confusion for the words which I, Jehovah, have spoken to thee."[6]

"I, Jesus, speak to-day; yesterday my angel delivered my will."[7]

"I, Jehovah, will plead my cause to the terror of this land and other nations."[8]

This mode of speaking *in the person* of God, though apparently more rarely used by Kotter and Poniatowsky, runs through the whole of the prophecies of Drabicius; and this language, it must be observed, is used, not in

[1] Ib. pp. 241—4.

[2] "Tertio, Neminem nostrûm qui hæc admirati pro extraordinariis divinis monitis admisimus, præcipitantia et levitate usos; sed quia rerum veritate, divinisque intervenientibus signis convicti, hæc spiritibus bonis administris fieri vidimus." p. 250.

[3] Ib. pp. 8, 9. [4] p. 9. [5] p. 148.

[6] p. 154. [7] p. 155. [8] p. 168.

the way in which it occurs in the prophecies of Scripture, where it stands in connexion with a previous declaration, that this was the message God had directed the prophet to deliver, and is spoken by the prophet as a thing which had been *previously* revealed *to him*, but as proceeding from God himself speaking personally through man, as his passive organ of utterance.

Comenius published, in 1663, as we have mentioned, a "Continuation of the History of the Revelations of Nicholas Drabicius, from 1659 to 1663," from which it appears that during this period he and his brethren had been exercised with still further doubts as to these revelations, and in which occurs a truly excellent prayer, drawn up by them for the use of the members of their communion generally on the subject, but which also clearly shows,[9] that he was not yet disposed to give them up himself, nor, as it appears from the conclusion, the majority of his brethren.

We may trust, however, that his and their fervent prayers were finally answered, for of him at least we can record, that in his last book, entitled "*Unum Necessarium*," written in 1668, in the 77th year of his age, he "bemoaned" this work,[1] and acquaints us also with the resolution he had made of employing all his future thoughts on his salvation.[2] "He died at Amsterdam, 1671, in his 80th year. Had he lived much longer he would have seen the falsity of his [own] prophecies with regard to the millennium, which he affirmed would begin in 1672 or 1673."[3] "Poor Drabicius," as the historian of the Brethren informs us, "was taken up; and after his right hand had been cut off, burnt together with his prophecies."[4]

Such was the termination of this remarkable case, the whole of which I would earnestly commend to the reader's careful consideration, as it appears to me to form one of

[9] See particularly pp. 17—23.
[1] Cranz's Hist. of the United Brethren. (English transl.) p. 72.
[2] Chalmers's Biog. Dict. under "Comenius."
[3] Chalmers, ib.
[4] Cranz's History. (English Translation.) p. 72.

the most instructive examples of the kind on record. The sketch here given is necessarily a very brief one, and might have been much enlarged with particulars, showing the very specious nature of these pretensions, and the number, learning, and piety of those who were deceived. The references, however, given in the notes will enable any reader who is so disposed, to obtain all the particulars connected with the case.

To know the *plausible* appearance of these manifestations, we need only observe what Jurieu says of them. Although, he says, at first he could not find himself much disposed to give credit to them, yet he "could not but be touched with a secret opinion that in all this there might be something more than human," and therefore, "as the holy Virgin," he "kept these sayings in his heart."

"I found," he adds, "something surprising and extraordinary in the prophecies of Cotterus, Christina, and Drabicius, which are published by Comenius. Cotterus, who is the first of the three, is great and magnific; the images of his visions have so much majesty and grandeur, that those of the antient prophets have hardly more. They are also admirably laid together, every thing supports itself, and one part doth not contradict another. I cannot conceive how a simple artisan could have imagined such great things without divine assistance. *The two years of the prophecy of Christina are, in my judgment, a train of as great miracles as have ever been since the apostles' days, and even the life of the greatest prophets hath nothing in it more miraculous than what happened to that maid.* Drabicius hath also his heights and excellencies, but for the most part he is obscure." [5]

The next case I shall mention is that of those who were commonly called the Camisars, or, the French and English prophets; who appeared first in France in the year 1688, and in this country early in the following century; commencing here with some French emigrants who came over to this country in 1706 and 1707, as the remnants of a

[5] Preface to his "Accomplishment of the Prophecies." Engl. ed.

large body of similar pretenders that had harassed some parts of France since their first appearance in 1688.

They first arose in Dauphiny in France, in the spring of 1688, where it is said that "the first that laid claim to these extraordinary gifts was one William du Serre, who dwelt in a village called Dieu-le-fit in Dauphiné," [6] and "one of the first a poor shepherd's daughter of fourteen or fifteen years old, as ignorant and untaught as one can imagine." [7]

"His [Du Serre's] example, instruction, the novelty of the subject, and the approbation it found among the multitude, so increased the number of these prophets, that before the end of February following there arose in Dauphiné, and then in the Vivarez, five or six hundred Protestants of both sexes that gave out themselves to be prophets, and inspired of the Holy Ghost. The favourable reception they met with in prophesying the downfall of Pharaoh, the ruin of Antichrist and Babylon, and the deliverance of the church . . . so far prevailed, that in three or four months after, the sect of the Inspired became so numerous that the valleys swarmed with them, the mountains were covered with them, and the dioceses of Usez, &c. were overspread with such a number of prophets, that in the Cevennes and the lower Languedoc only, they were computed at eight thousand souls." [8]

The nature of these supposed inspirations is very fully depicted in a book published by a Mr. Lacy, one of their principal supporters and prophets in this country, from which I subjoin a few extracts.[9]

"The prophets said, that their fits had somewhat in them marvellous and divine, and that they came upon them

[6] Enthusiastic Impostors no Divinely-inspired Prophets. London, 1707. 8vo. p. 2.

[7] F. Hutchinson's Short View of the pretended Spirit of Prophecy. Lond. 1708. 8vo. p. 2.; and,—Cry from the Desert. Lond. 1708. 8vo. p. 1.

[8] Enthusiastic Impostors, &c. p. 2. See also, Cry from the Desert, pp. 5, 6.

[9] A Cry from the Desert; or, Testimonials of the miraculous things lately come to pass in the Cevennes. Translated from the originals. 2nd. edit. with a Preface by John Lacy, Esq. Lond. 1707. 8vo. This is a translation of,—

with tremblings and faintings as in a swoon, which made them stretch out their arms and legs, and stagger several times before they dropt down; they struck themselves with the hand, they fell on their backs, they shut their eyes, they heaved with the breast, they remained a while in trances, and coming out of them with twitchings, they uttered all that came into their mouths . . . . . When the prophet had been under agitations of body for a while, he began to preach and to prophesy . . . . Brethren, said the prophet, amend your lives; repent ye; the end of all things draws nigh . . . . All they said at those times was heard and received with reverence and awe. *Persons of good sense, even Catholics themselves,* [against whom many of the prophecies were levelled,] *knew not what to think of it, to hear little boys and young girls of the dregs of mankind, who could not so much as read, quote many texts of the Holy Scripture.*"[1]

"When I came to the assembly, there was a girl preached with an eloquence and fluency to me most admirable. This girl, after the Spirit of God had honoured her with his gifts, learned a little to read; when her sermon was over, there came in many more who showed great desire to hear her; she said she was no ways able, of herself, to gratify them, but presently fell upon her knees, and earnestly besought God of his good pleasure to unloose her tongue, that she might again declare his word for the consolation of his people: she was immediately answered; the Spirit fell upon her, and she made a long prayer; *methought I heard an angel, so charming were the words that came from her mouth!* after prayer she set a psalm, and tuned it melodiously; then she gave us *a discourse so excellent, so pathetic, so well digested,* with that holy gracefulness and ardent zeal,

Le Théatre Sacré des Cevennes, &c. A Londr. 1707. 8vo.—published in April, 1707, by Maximilian Misson, one of the party. The work consists of a collection of testimonies respecting the prophets, partly extracted from works of reputation published in France, and partly from the affidavits of eye-witnesses before magistrates.

[1] Cry, pp. 6, 7; from De Brueys's Hist. of Fanaticism, printed at Paris, 1692.

that we could not but believe it was more than human that spoke in her; *a poor simple girl*, as she was, could never certainly be capable of speaking at that rate. I went away pierced to the very heart and soul, and full of the impression of those wonderful things that faithful servant of God had pronounced . . . . *She quoted many texts of the Old and New Testament as if she had the whole Bible by heart, ... and she applied them so aptly that affected us strangely.* . . . . She declared these things in the name of God all-sufficient . . . . *She promised also, on the same part, after a manner very powerful, exact, and pressing, that religion in its purity should be re-established in the kingdom.*"[2]

Another tells us of a "child thirteen or fourteen months old, and covered then in the cradle, which had never of itself spoken a word, nor could it go alone: when my friends and I came in where it was, the child spoke distinctly in French with a voice small like a child, but loud enough to be well heard all over the room; it exhorted, like others in that condition, to the works of repentance."[3]

"From the beginning of 1689, for seven years complete, until my leaving that country, I saw in the Vellay abundance of people of every age and sex, that fell into violent agitations of body in an extraordinary manner, during which they uttered large discourses, very pious and strongly hortatory of repentance; they had *also predictions of the ruin of mystical Babylon, with assurances that the Church would speedily be delivered out of affliction.*" . . . . Lucretia Clare, one of *extraordinary piety and meekness*, my particular acquaintance, received the gift of exhortation at the age of sixteen or seventeen; she made admirable discourses to the assemblies. Having a long time laboured in God's vineyard, she had a command by inspiration to withdraw to Geneva; she was conveyed thither in safety by divine Providence, through a sea of

[2] Cry, pp. 9, 10. Testim. of Matthew Boisier of Dauphiny.
[3] Cry, p. 15. Testim. of John Vernet of Bois Chastel.

dangers, where she died three years after, to the great affliction of all that knew her; but her end was so glorious and happy, that those who lamented her could not, however, but testify a joy for the endless felicity of that select servant of God." [4]

"Several of those persons I saw violently agitated; during the inspiration they had great shakings of the whole body, motions of the head, the arm, and the breast; their exhortations to repentance were urgent, and they assured that God would *shortly destroy Babylon* . . . . . I heard many of those after the inspiration ceased say, they could not repeat the things they had said in it; *I am certain and positive, as of a thing particularly observed by me, that the people who had those gifts immediately forsook all sorts of vanity and looseness; some who had been debauched became presently sober and pious, and all those that followed them became also more regular, and led exemplary lives.*" [5]

"Many of the inspired being of my neighbourhood and acquaintance, I frequently heard and saw several not exceeding seven or eight years old; some of them, and others too of riper age, being asked in my hearing to recite or give an account after the paroxysm was over, of what they had said in it, they replied they could not remember so as to do it; I observed often the inspired to employ themselves among other good works in *reconciling neighbours at variance*, and they were successful in it." [6]

"I am very sure I have seen *sixty* other children, between *three and twelve years* of age, in the same condition; [*i. e.* under the supposed prophetic agitations;] the discourses of all which tended constantly to press with ardour an amendment of life, and foretold also several things . . . *Several persons of both sexes I have heard in their ecstasies pronounce certain words which seemed to the standers*

[4] Cry, pp. 16, 17. Testim. of Isabel Charras, of Les Roches.
[5] Ibid. pp. 20, 21. Testim. of John Cabanel, of Anduze.
[6] Ibid. p. 23. Testim. of James Brisson, of Brignon.

by to be some foreign language, and in effect he that spoke declared sometimes what his preceding words signified."[7]

" In the village of Aubissargues, I saw three or four small children, between three and six years of age, in particular that of James Bousiege, aged about three, who was taken with the Spirit . . . . he said that we were in the last times, that we ought to fight bravely the fight of faith, exhorting at the same time to repentance in general. Another of these little infants was Susan Joncquet, between four and five years old . . . . . she spake louder, in good French, as she could not out of that fit. She said, *the church's delivery would soon be;* she moved those present to a due regulation of life. . . . . My brother Peter, between fifteen and sixteen years of age, also, I heard in our house several times in his inspiration . . . . He spake on this occasion, and also in his other inspirations, good French, *though I am certain out of them he could not speak one word such.*"[8]

" Some of my acquaintance invited me to go to an assembly of people, that met together for prayer . . . . . A third youth fell like the rest into ecstasy; after some struggles he arose full of the Spirit . . . . . *I began with more freedom to beseech him* [*God*] *to make known his will to me, and to inspire me with horror for those things, if they were not from him, but on the contrary, if they were the gifts of his grace, he would please to engrave them on my heart.* The young preacher prayed admirably . . . . . he said after it, that the text of Scripture, which would be the subject of the discourse the Holy Spirit would then put into his mouth, was in the fifty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, the first and second verses, 'Ho every one that thirsteth,' &c.; he spoke *two full hours* together, with a wonderful freedom, and said so many excellent affecting things, that the whole assembly fell into tears, and I among the rest. . . . . None of them [*i. e.* his words] were lost, for they

[7] Cry, pp. 31, 32. Testim. of James du Bois, of Montpellier.

[8] Ibid, pp. 35, 36. Testim. of William Bruguier, of Aubissargues.

were all pertinent to the subject, all suited to the capacity of the good and simple audience, though at the same time sublime and heavenly. *Where is the child able to perform such things?* Every body said, this little youth could not read, but, if he could, certainly of himself he must be utterly incapable to make such a discourse," &c. . . . . " The boldness of this youth astonished me, and the method wherein he took cognizance of my *inward workings*, and related them to the congregation; and, in short, how marvellous a thing was it, that a child so bashful and ignorant should take upon him to instruct an assembly, *for him to preach in a language he knew not how to speak at another time*, to express himself in a lofty style, to pour out excellent instructions in abundance." The result of this upon the relator was, that he himself became similarly inspired, and in the description of his own case, gives the following statement;—" Some persons . . . . have importuned me to suppress and reject to my utmost the holy and blessed visits of my Comforter, but I beseech them, in the name of God, to call to mind those direful judgments threatened upon such who, being once partakers of the Holy Ghost, do, as much as in them lies, cast from them the heavenly gift they had tasted; and I here declare solemnly, without any equivocation whatsoever, by this public act, upon the oath I make of it before God, *that I am in no wise the framer of those bodily agitations I suffer in my ecstasies, I do not move my own self, but am moved by a power independent that overrules me; and for the words that proceed from my mouth, I protest with the same awful solemnity, they are formed without my intention, and glide forth of my lips without my direction, my mind no ways bearing any part in that marvellous operation by preceding forethought, or any attending will to deliver what I do at that instant.* Through the grace of my God the inspirations he has pleased to send me, from the first unto this day, have had no other influence upon myself, in particular, than *to forsake evil and do well;* I acknowledge, nevertheless, to my own grief, that I am a

poor wormling of the earth, and a grievous sinner, who continually make myself altogether unworthy of the favours showed me from on high; but humbly do I sue to his mercy, through Jesus Christ my Saviour." [9]

Another describing his first seizure, says, "I was surprised with a shivering all over me, and some agitation; the weight upon my breast was less than before, [this symptom having preceded the agitation,] and here I found a gentle breathing springing up within me, whereat I was surprised a little, though I made no great reflection on it, at the same time *my tongue and lips were of a sudden forced to pronounce words with vehemence that I was myself amazed to hear,* having forethought nothing, and no ways intending to speak; the things spoken by me were hortatory of repentance, and this lasted but three or four minutes." [1]

"I went . . . to see a girl, between six and seven years of age, who fell into inspiration before us . . . . . she constantly maintained that it was not she herself framed those bodily motions, nor had she the purpose and will to utter those things which *an invisible overruling power made her to do* . . . . . To suppose an impostor in such an infant, and a thousand others, seemed ridiculous; to adjudge the same to be madness or frenzy appeared equally extravagant; to say she was drunk, as was foolishly imputed to the apostles, in the second of Acts, wanted even a colour; to ascribe the urgent preaching of repentance and the gospel to the enemy of God, with those circumstances observable in the inspired to the last breath of their lives, and even at the gibbet, was the height of folly." [2]

The following is the account given by Elias Marion, the most noted of those who came over to this country, of his joining the prophets. "On New Year's Day, 1703, I had the happiness to be solaced with the heavenly manna

[9] Cry, pp. 37—44. Testim. of John Cavalier, of Sauve, one of the principal of those who came over to England.

[1] Ibid, p. 60. Testim. of Durand Fage.

[2] Cry, p. 75. Testim. of David Flotard, of Vigan.

I found in that divine book, [the Bible,] our family with some friends being engaged for part thereof in prayer and fasting; in the evening, Peter, one of my brothers, had an inspiration, and some minutes after I perceived on a sudden a great burning round my heart, that spread after over all my body; I was also a little oppressed at the lungs, that made me fetch deep sighs, but I suppressed them what I could. Some moments after an irresistible force prevailed over me altogether, which made me cry out with interruptions of gulping like a hiccup, and my eyes poured out a flood of tears; I was then struck violently with an affrighting view of my sins, that appeared black and dismal and infinite in number; I found them like a load bearing down my head, and the more that weight pressed me, the more my cries and tears increased; my spirit was filled with horror, and in this anguish I could neither speak nor pray; nevertheless I found withal some good and comforting reflections which prevented my horror from turning into murmuring and despair; my God struck me, and at the same time supported; in this condition my brother, falling again into inspiration, said aloud, that my own sins occasioned that grief, mentioning at the same time a long list of them, and set them forth before all the company, *as if he had seen or read them in my own heart;* I could not myself have given so exact an account of my condition. When he had finished this black roll, wherein nothing was forgot, and insisted chiefly on those sins which most affected my mind, I found myself somewhat eased; a calm succeeded, my burden grew lighter, and I relished with a great deal of pleasure the liberty restored me to raise my heart and voice up to God. This precious season was improved by supplication without ceasing to my heavenly Father, who, according to his infinite mercies, spoke peace then to my soul, and wiped away the tears from mine eyes. The night following I slept quietly, but upon awaking I fell into the like agitations, that ever since have taken me with the ecstasy, interrupted often with gulpings of the wind-pipe; this happened to me

usually two or three times a day for three weeks or a month ensuing, and God put it into my heart to employ that time in fasting and prayer; my consolation augmented from day to day, and at length, blessed be the name of God, I came to possess that happy satisfaction of mind which is great gain. I was now altogether changed; the things most delightful to me, before my Creator made my heart anew, became distasteful and even intolerable to me; at length it was a new spring of joys to my soul, when, after a month's silent ecstasies, if they might properly be so called, it pleased God to loosen my tongue, and put his word into my mouth; as his Holy Spirit had actuated my body to awaken its drowsiness and break down my confidence in it, so it was his pleasure to overrule my tongue and lips, and make use of those my weak organs according to his good will. I will not pretend fully to express what was my astonishment and joy when I *felt and heard flow through my mouth a stream of holy words*, whereof my mind was no ways the author, and which ravished my ears to hear it." [3]

"Most of the inspired were young people, and very ignorant, and those spoke ordinarily best in their revelation; some of them told me they could remember nothing said by them in that time, others could somewhat, but very little." [4]

"A poor girl, of fourteen or fifteen, waiting upon me in my chamber, was of a sudden taken with bodily motions, like to convulsive . . . . after a few minutes of this condition, she spoke out distinctly and clearly, though with interruptions and trembling. The drift of the discourse was to solicit sinners to repentance, expressing herself in French, doubtless against her custom, for in that country, people of her rank and age speak a very corrupt tongue, and can speak no other . . . . . What was most remarkable in this affair, and touched me at that time most, was *a revelation she uttered which proved to be presently con-*

[3] Cry, pp. 84, 85. Testim. of Elias Marion, of Barre.
[4] Ibid. pp. 111, 112. Testim. of De Caladon.

firmed [which was of the routing of some of the king's troops, two leagues off, by a body of Camisars]. . . . . Abundance of people of sobriety and reputation have assured me it was common with the inspired to *discover the thoughts of others, and to reveal many things which they could not be acquainted with in a natural way.* When this girl came to herself, I asked her if she could repeat what she had said; she answered, No." [5]

These supposed prophetic gifts were also said to be supported by many miracles. This book abounds with alleged instances of them. The inspired are often warned beforehand of the approach of an enemy; [6] directed by a star to the place of assembly; [7] preserved from the effects of bullets; [8] and one of them is said, upon the testimony of several witnesses, to have remained for some time unhurt in the midst of a fire,[9] and many other similar instances are mentioned.

In fundamental points of doctrine they appear, by all accounts, to have been perfectly sound. No material error on this head, indeed, is laid to their charge. And Mr. Lacy, in his preface to the book so often quoted, states, as one reason for his receiving them, that they had neither in London or the Cevennes "advanced anything contrary to sound doctrine; in particular, they all hold the truth as it is in Jesus; He is among them the foundation and corner-stone; whoever teaches a different gospel, and derogates from the honour of our Lord, let him be with us anathema maranatha . . . . . The Trinity of persons in the Deity is positively asserted; the Scriptures directed to be read as the supreme rule of faith and manners," &c. [1]

The external moral and religious character of these persons, also, was eminently irreproachable; which is testified not only in many parts of the work already quoted,[2] but particularly published to the world as a thing which could

[5] Cry, p. 119. Testim. of Mad. M. R., of Montpellier.
[6] Ibid. pp. 27; 45, 46. [7] Ibid. p. 27. [8] Ibid. p. 94.
[9] Ibid. pp. 50—52; 57, 58; 65, 66. [1] Preface to ditto, pp. 13, 14.
[2] Cry, passim, and see p. 78.

not be denied, by Mr. Lacy, in his preface. "It was a peculiar satisfaction," he says, "to the instruments of this collection, to find the concurrent testimony of all that the inspired in the Cevennes, from the time they were honoured with the gift, were, without exception, unreproachable in that point [sanctity of life]. Mr. Matthew Boissier . . . . was a man of eminent sanctity . . . . . The Savoy Consistory, who have dealt so hardly with them all, as impostors, have hitherto laid nothing of immorality to their charge, and two persons of note in that society did, about the beginning of January last, in private conversation, tell me there was nothing of that kind imputed to them . . . . The characters which are the most usual fruits of the Holy Spirit's inhabitation are evident upon the said Mr. Marion, Mr. Fage, and Mr. Cavalier; for instance, a constant serenity, and even joy, seemingly flowing from the great Comforter, since their worldly circumstances no ways supply it; a cheerful contented abstinence more than needs; *a temper of forgiveness, easy reconcileableness and charity towards those who do them wrong; assiduous prayer, frequent fasting, and reading of the Scriptures;* a frequenting of public worship and communion, till driven away; *a freedom from affectation in peculiarities of speech and behaviour;* and though the obscurity and meanness of their condition makes the lustre of their lives less exemplary, they have what is of all other things the most characteristic of the true messengers of God, *an humility and lowliness of mind*, very resplendent in the eyes of those who will stoop to behold it."[3]

Their sincerity was certainly put, in France, to the strongest test, that of cruel martyrdom. And hence they, not unnaturally, say, "As these holy inspirations led us to victory over our enemies in the field, much more gloriously did they enable our martyrs to triumph over them on the scaffolds; there it was that the power of the Almighty did great things; that was the dreadful furnace wherein the truth and faithfulness of the saints inspired were tried indeed;

[3] Lacy's Preface to Cry, pp. xi—xiii.

the admirable words of consolation, and the triumphing songs of a great number of those thrice happy martyrs, whilst their bones were breaking on the wheel, and the flames were devouring their flesh, were, doubtless, a considerable testimony that their inspirations proceeded of the Author of every perfecting gift." [4]

Every thing, indeed, was done by inspiration. "Was it that we were to attack the enemy? were we pursued by them? did the night overtake us? were ambushes apprehended? did some unlucky accident fall out? or if at a loss for the place of religious assembling;—we fell on the knee, 'Lord, appear to our help, make known to us thy good pleasure, what we are to do, most for thy glory and our own welfare,' was the common course, and immediately we received a direction from the Spirit." [5]

It was, in fact, by the Spirit's express direction that they took arms against the king's troops. "It was only," says Elias Marion, "by the inspirations and their repeated orders, that we began the war for the enjoyment of our holy religion." [6]

And yet, notwithstanding these injunctions, interferences, and revelations of the Spirit, as they supposed, they were in a few years miserably exterminated by the king's troops, and all their prophecies respecting the *speedy* downfal of Babylon, by which they meant the Romish church, and the establishment of Christ's kingdom, left to the present hour unaccomplished.

Of the survivors, a few of the principal came over to this country in 1706, of whom the chief were Marion, Cavalier, and Fage. Still undeceived themselves, they proceeded in this country in the same way as before, and soon obtained many followers, and among them in particular a Mr. Lacy, a man of character and fortune, to whom all concur in giving the highest testimony for integrity and piety, and,

[4] Cry, p. 98. Testim. of Elias Marion; and see pp. 8, 93.
[5] Ibid. pp. 69, 70.
[6] Ibid. p. 96; and see pp. 86, 91, 101.

except in this instance, good sense;[7] and also Sir Richard Bulkley, a man of unimpeachable character and some learning. The characteristics of the French and English prophets in this country were, as was to be expected, precisely the same as they had been in France, and therefore I shall only add, respecting them, some of the circumstances that attended their proceedings here.

Their revelations in this country were most of them published, and a reference to any one of these publications, will enable the reader to judge fully of their character. They consist principally of urgent exhortations to repentance and holiness, promises of blessings to the children of God, denunciations of speedily approaching judgments on the ungodly, and the establishment, within a very short period, of Christ's kingdom upon earth, united with plentiful censures of the clergy and ministers in general.[8]

They were *all* of them delivered as if these persons had been the mere passive organs of utterance to the Holy Spirit.

As a specimen of the nature of their prophetic utterances, (of which those *in print* are very voluminous, those of Mr. Lacy alone being larger than all the prophecies of Scripture put together,) take the following from Mr. Lacy's "Warnings," spoken, it must be recollected, without any introduction such as, Thus saith the Lord,—but like our present claimants, as if God himself constrained his tongue to pronounce them.

"I will be Lord alone in my Church. I will scourge

[7] Mr. Hutchinson in particular says, "When Mr. Lacy writes, not by his enthusiastic spirit, but by his own judgment, he shows himself a person of good sense and piety." Short View, p. 22. And see "Enthus. Impost." p. 37.

[8] See Elias Marion's Prophetical Warnings. London, 1707. 8vo. John Lacy's Prophetical Warnings. [Three Parts.] London, 1707. 8vo. Relation of the Dealings of God to John Lacy. London, 1708. 8vo. A Collection of Prophetical Warnings of the Eternal Spirit. London, 1708. 8vo. Abr. Whitro's Warnings of the Eternal Spirit, with a Preface by R. Bulkley. London, 1709. 8vo. &c. &c.

out of my temple mercenary usurpers of my prerogative." (Pt. i. p. 82.)—"Why is it that my coming is a snare upon the inhabitants of the earth? They will admit no warning. . . . . All teachers that set themselves in opposition to the sole Shepherd and the sole unerring Guide of spirits, must be disowned before I can teach." (Pt. ii. p. 3—5.) "Do you in earnest desire more eminent gifts? Why, then, do not you make it known by express strong pleadings with me in prayer?" (p. 50.) "No, they look upon it, now the world is created, and all the elements, and all the spheres finished, there is no need of looking to me, for any thing that has any appearance to arise from my creatures. No, they will not believe . . . . . Now, they believe there is nothing at all immediate comes from me." (p. 127.) "If the All-wise speak and contradict your notions, why, if he speaks by the voice of a man, that man is mad. So you are wiser, it seems, than I can inspire any one to be. . . . You are so wise to judge and determine without hearing God *speak for himself*." (p. 160.)

"The ministration of the Spirit to others, to people of different dispositions, and parties, and interests, the ministration of the Spirit to them, is a proof of its speaking in the former messengers . . . The universal restraint upon my servants from speaking their own distinct opinions and party-prejudices, is a proof that this dispensation is to suppress them all; and out of all *to form a new lump*. . . . Every one sect pretends they would be glad of union; but then it is with a reserve never to depart from their own positions . . . . and therefore I must root them all up . . . When there shall be *nothing of man allowed*; and my Spirit in any individual shall always be JUDGED BY THE SAME SPIRIT in other persons; and all be immediately under the government and guidance of the same spirit, you shall see the Scriptures better understood, more obeyed," &c. (Pt. iii. pp. 75, 6.)

"How did those that heard the voice out of their mouths, know it was God's and not theirs? If you were to prove it by the Scriptures, there are no footsteps of the matters

demonstrative of the nature of the thing. *It admits no demonstration to sensual persons* . . . . Where there can be no interest from men; . . . . where there is no encouragement whatsoever possible to be from the world; why should any admit a thought that one otherwise fearing God should so against his own interest, should so to his own suffering, run the hazard of his utter everlasting torment and misery by profaning my name? . . . If he, therefore, such a one, would not thrust himself into such a message, whence can it be? Was there ever any one acted by a spirit of delusion, that hath not advanced, uttered, any thing contrary to the Scriptures or dissonant from them? . . . . Were it the interest of an evil spirit of delusion to bespeak and forewarn the world of a time when all evil spirits are to be suppressed, when the glory of God's truth is shining forth without clouds? Is this like a spirit of deluding, to declare such a general superintendency and direct influence of the holy eternal Spirit upon every one? Every one must know whether it be a spirit leading him to holiness. For no evil spirit would lead to God and holiness, without a mixture of the world, &c. . . . . I have promised miraculous powers such as God only can work, and come not within the power of any man or men to perform. Is it not, then, irrational to conclude in the mean while? . . . What is the end of my giving warning of approaching judgments, but that men might humble themselves; might turn and seek me? &c. . . . *Do you any think, that the eternal Holy One will not attest to himself upon your humble petition? Did God ever give a serpent, when you asked a fish?* . . . If I choose to attest to my message by signs and wonders, different from those of Moses and the apostles, and if I at length pour down the flood of my vengeance upon the world, am I not at liberty to do it in my own manner in doing these things?" (Pt. iii. pp. 77—83.) "Christians pray for particular graces, and omit to pray for the Author of them, who did, and will, dwell, and be found of them that seek him . . . . The exploding the verity of

my spirit's immediate operations has made the posture of religion so lifeless and fruitless as it is." (p. 99.) "Did not I command, earnestly to seek the best gifts; even such as none now-a-days for some ages have sought for from me? They are revolted. *A church now without him that formed it first!* . . . . The Holy Spirit grieved . . . withdrew his . . . presence. A seed only remained, and *occult communications to some.* But now the time prescribed by the Father being come, he will not, as in the first ages, visit his people with a temporary light . . . but there shall be light such as will for ever expel all shades, all clouds and darkness." (pp. 103, 104.) "Those that agree all to cry up a delusion, delusion, are the most averse to inquire into it. . . . Their consciousness of its being a verity, the fear that it should be real, makes them resolve not so much as to look into it. . . . *Were it not more agreeable to the character of upright, holy, good Christians, with sobriety and integrity of mind to inquire distinctly,* and then to satisfy the world by evidences collected of the delusion or verity thereof?" (p. 110.) "Is it honourable to people trained up in the knowledge of my word, to persist in opposing till they have the same demonstrations as would, and will, convince and convert the heathen, the Mahometans, the Jews?" (p. 113.) "Love to me is best exprest by concern for my glory, my honour, my great name; denying yourselves, renouncing the world, and your own love to one another. Grow, therefore, in grace, and in this of love to me, the first and great command." (p. 115.) "No wonder the world receive you not; no wonder they hate you. So did they by the prophets of old. . . . THE CHRISTIAN WORLD IS ALIENATED FROM THE LIFE OF GOD. That which was *the essence of Christianity,* the gift and power of the Holy Ghost, is now overlooked, disregarded, contemned, rejected." (p. 116.) "Do you expect an outward, a material proof of a spirit? Can you expect that as the person that knows, that finds many ways, a superior power distinct from him, and always tending to holiness, and

changing his life, and his heart, and forcing his tongue and mouth, all these only at times when there is a manifestation even to sense of some strange power which he knows independent of him? . . . I have given you such an outward token, separate from which token none of the persons that have it are able to say the things they have said in it." (pp. 125, 126.) "He that is *spiritual* shall witness to others *that are spiritual*." (p. 128.) "The apostles ascribed the propagation of my truth to the agency of my immediate Spirit, not their own. The things they allege expressive of the indwelling of that holy everlasting Spirit are the same that I now urge constantly; prayer without ceasing, rejoicing always though in tribulation, and thankfulness to God . . . The declaring these [*i. e.* "things to come"] before they come, and *the witness of a man's* OWN SOUL *that they are performed*, is sufficient to him. These are the ways by which any one may know of himself assuredly: by his inward joys immediate; by his extraordinary secret prayers; by a supernatural power in his mouth and body; by the consonancy of the Scriptures to all the symptoms of my discoveries and revelations to him." (p. 141.) "The apostles so received the holy anointing that the same was to be diffused *more than in their days*. (p. 144.) "I have given a small sprinkling of several of my promised gifts to my servants of this nation, which I have called; of tongues, of prayer, of discerning spirits, of exhortation, of reproof, of prediction; and to thyself, of signs upon thy person, of healing, of opening the Scriptures that concern my kingdom; though as yet, neither they nor thou knowest any thing comparatively of what ye shall do, and that very quickly." (pp. 145, 146.) "I have declared [*i. e.* in the Scriptures], the testimonies of Jesus should *be the revived spirit of prophecy*." (p. 151.) "No one ever spoke in my name, but he himself had full conviction and assurance of my sending him. This conviction and assurance I gave the person, was not given to all. Such do I give now. And the apostles pleaded their own assurance from the tes-

timony of my spirit to themselves. . . . The testimony of miracles preceding the commission I have not always given, nor always concurrent with it. . . . The foundation of this dispensation of my spirit in its discoveries is the neglected and obscured part of Holy Writ." (p. 165.)

These are not *peculiar* passages in these warnings, but exactly similar to all the rest, and in fact, to all the other effusions of the party, of which many were published: and there needs no remark to remind the reader how remarkably they agree, and in fact are identical, with those of our modern claimants to the prophetic character.

Here, as in France, children were the subjects of the supposed prophetic influence. Of one of these Sir R. Bulkley says, that he would "after, and under great agitations, pray in public in a strange family, constantly thrice a day . . . for ten days together, with exhortations almost each time following; and every time, the prayers in different words, though the subject matter of them may be reasonably supposed to be the same as to the several seasons respectively; and sometimes petitions inserted, not mentioned in any of the former prayers, upon new preceding occasions occurring, from the objections or the obstinacy of some unbelievers . . . . As to this matter of fact, though it be the least evidence of a hundred, I might say of a thousand, I solemnly affirm it to be truth, having been present at every one of them, and having taken most of them in writing."[9]

Here also they more expressly laid claim to speak by inspiration *in languages unknown to them*, particularly Mr. Lacy. Many of his printed revelations are in Latin, and a very small portion in Greek;[1] some also in French; of all which effusions he thus speaks: "As to myself, I know that I do not now so much as understand the English of many words of them, [*i. e.* the Latin pro-

[9] Sir R. Bulkley's Preface to "Warnings of the Eternal Spirit," by Abr. Whitro. Lond. 1709, 8vo. p. 3.

[1] Warnings, pt. 1. pp. 67 and 88.

phecies,] but as the inspiration itself does at the time teach me inwardly the sense of them, nor do I at all know the true conjugations, and even yet, when out of the ecstasy, I am utterly incapable of composing any thing of that kind, though upon the utmost deliberation and thought . . . . . In like manner, there are hundreds in this city who can attest, that the French I speak at other times is far short of what is here delivered in that language. The Greek words mentioned in some of these discourses came likewise from my mouth, and the sense of them was clearly impressed upon me in the moment of pronouncing, though the words I otherwise understood not."[2] To this he appeals as one of the best evidences of his own divine mission,[3] and that of the French prophets in the Cevennes, who, he says, had "the ready utterance of a language, which out of ecstasy they could not speak."[4]

Sir Richard Bulkley also informs us, that he heard a Mr. Dutton, who did not know one Hebrew letter from another, "utter with great readiness and freedom complete discourses in Hebrew, for near a quarter of an hour together, and sometimes much longer."[5]

These productions in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and French, were all spoken to plain English people, of whom but few knew any but their mother tongue, and as it appears that Mr. Lacy himself was unable to construe his Latin and Greek, (of which the syntax is certainly inexplicable,) it is as difficult to conceive their use or purpose as of "the unknown tongue" in the present day. Moreover, they were not at that time without the evidence of an "*unknown tongue.*" Of the prophets in the Cevennes this has been already mentioned above.[6] Of those in England we have a similar testimony. Of Fage in particular, that he spoke it several times, and "said that the nation that spoke

[2] Preface to his Warnings, pt. 1, p. x.

[3] Relation of God's dealings with J. Lacy, p. 21.

[4] Preface to Cry from the Desert, pp. xviii, xix.

[5] Sir R. Bulkley's Answer to several Treatises, &c. pp. 93, 94.

[6] See pp. 173, 4, above.

this language should in a short time receive the gospel."[7] The same was done also by Cavalier.[8]

They laid claim also to the same power of *working miracles*, particularly of healing. *Many* cases of this kind are related by Mr. Lacy,[9] and particularly one of curing blindness.[1] Sir R. Bulkley also affirms that he was himself the subject of some "signs and wonders wrought toward him," after some "words had been in a very solemn manner pronounced to him" by "one of the inspired."[2]

Nor were they afraid to venture various *predictions*, some of so general a kind, as hardly to be capable of confutation by events, if men chose to explain them away, but others happily so express, and of which the fulfilment was promised in so short a time, that, however they might prove their sincerity, and that they were not willingly deceivers, when they staked their reputation upon that of which a very short period would show the foundation, they were soon clearly refuted from their own mouths.

One of these was, that dreadful judgments would in *three weeks* (which the utterer explained himself to mean "three weeks as commonly understood") fall upon the city of London; that in a moment the air was to be filled with horror and darkness, &c.[3] But when the event proved the falsehood of the prediction, they interpreted the three weeks, as three *prophetic* weeks,[4] which, however, time has proved equally false.

Another was an express prediction that a Dr. Emes, who died December 22, 1707, was to be raised from the dead, May 25, 1708, which was predicted by several of the prophets.[5] Dr. Emes was assured of this by Mr. Lacy be-

[7] Enthusiastic Impostors, &c. pp. 22, 23.

[8] Ib. p. 111.

[9] Relation of God's dealings with him, pp. 24—27, and, Warnings, pt. 2.

[1] Warnings, pt. 2, pp. 110—114.

[2] Answer to several Treatises, pp. 110—112.

[3] Enthus. Impost. p. 23. See also various parts of Lacy's Warnings.

[4] Enthus. Impost. p. 55.

[5] Predictions concerning the raising the dead body of Mr. J. Emes. Lond. 1708, 4to.

fore his death,[6] and the very day of his resurrection was afterwards named by one of the prophets.[7] When, however, the time was gone by, and there appeared no prospect of the prediction being fulfilled, Mr. Lacy and his friends contented themselves with publishing a paper, which they called, "Squire Lacy's reasons why Dr. Emes was not raised."

Many other such might be mentioned, but I add only this one, their favourite theme, and as they supposed particular message which they had to deliver from God. I give it in the words of Mr. Lacy, in his preface to the "Cry from the Desert." "The message [he says] is, that the grand jubilee, the acceptable year of the Lord, the accomplishment of those numerous scriptures touching the new heavens and new earth, *the kingdom of the Messiah* . . . . the marriage of the Lamb, the first resurrection, or the new Jerusalem descending from above, is now even at the door, and to be manifest over the whole earth within the short term of *three years* . . . . . They tell us this mission of his servants shall be witnessed to by signs and wonders from heaven, by a deluge of judgments on the wicked universally throughout the world, as famine, pestilence, earthquakes, fire from heaven, darkness, tempests," &c. &c.[8] And hence he not unjustly adds, "The reader may easily observe a great difference between them and some other people pretending to the like high privilege; for these are express, that the burden and proof of their commission will take place over all the world in a short space of time, *so that if nothing should visibly appear of the predicted diffusion of gifts and graces immediate, and of the signs and wonders judicial from heaven, the error of believing them will soon vanish of itself.*"[9] Fully convinced, however, himself of the truth of these predictions, his "Warnings," published soon after, are, as we have seen, full of declarations respecting the speedy

[6] Ib. p. 1.
[7] Ib. p. 8. Relation of God's dealings, &c. p. 29.
[8] Pref. to Cry, p. xxi.
[9] Ib. p. xxiii.

coming of "a kingdom to be ushered in with a great and terrible day."[1] "You [he says] that wait for the kingdom of Jesus Christ on earth, you now see it with your own eyes. *It is begun, I tell you, and doubt not of it.* . . . . . His envoys are upon the earth; they prepare the way . . . . You shall see the nations of the earth, you that are here present, you shall see them reunited to the God of heaven and earth."[2] "*The diffusion of my Spirit shows the time is come.*"[3] They are full, in fact, of these declarations and exhortations to men, to prepare for Christ's coming, and personal reign upon earth. And hence also he complains of the ministers of religion not teaching the approach of Christ. In the preface to the "Cry from the Desert," he says, "The writer hereof never read any of those Comments upon the prophetic parts of Scripture, but the late Essay of the Rev. Mr. Whiston upon the Revelation of St. John; and thence it sufficiently appears that several learned interpreters do differ about fixing the year when that gracious council [counsel] of heaven is to be clearly unfolded to the children of men; yet he observed that they all agree it will come before this generation pass away; being convinced also, by his own reading in history, that no period of the Christian era has afforded so universal a convulsion of states in Christendom as the twenty years now last past, it has induced a persuasion in him that Providence may therein have a design greater than to establish an equal balance among the potentates of Europe, which seems at present the only aim of the grand alliance . . . . . If the writings of the commentators above mentioned, who declare that great day to be approaching, were so received by their brethren of the clergy, that the flock of Christ were duly alarmed and warned by their pastors and watchmen to provide for it, according to the weak reasonings of men, this might suffice for the end aforesaid, but," &c.[4] And so he complains in his "Warnings,"—"Chris-

[1] Warnings, pt. 1, p. 40.
[2] Ibid. pt. 2, p. 192, 193.
[3] Ibid. pt. 3, p. 25.
[4] Pref. to Cry, pp. iv, v.

tians now only look upon Christ as dead and ascended into heaven. But where—where's the expectation taught of his coming again? A doctrine that has annexed to it the powers, the mighty gifts of the Holy Ghost engaged by promises. Is the state of Christianity now so perfect, that the powers and gifts of the Holy Ghost extraordinary are not worthy expecting or regarding? . . . . if it be laid as a powerful motive to denial of the world, humiliation, emptiness, and thirst after divine light and love; if it turns sinners from the evil of their ways; if the sudden approach of it be commonly insisted on as an urgent motive to redeem the time; whether all this be so, let men judge. Therefore an extraordinary dispensation to prepare for so extraordinary a revolution . . . . . sure there needs something extraordinary to prepare for so tremendous, awful, so joyous and blissful a state of the Church on earth. Nay, the wisest do need an extraordinary call for it."[5] "I have raised up many to enter their protests against their fellow-Christians, for not looking with an eye to my second coming. This ought to have been a warning to ministers in general to acquit themselves. But they, instead of looking into those things, they have universally condemned the looking into them."[6] "Grave gospel-teachers must be taught to spell and understand the *noblest part* of the gospel."[7]

Such were the characteristics of this memorable instance of a false claim to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit.

The feelings with which it was viewed on *each* side may be seen in the two following extracts. The first is from the pen of its most learned and able supporter in this country, Sir R. Bulkley.

"We," he says, "who have heard this voice of warning, and *know it to be the voice of God by better evidence than any of them can prove his own existence*, as great philosophers as they think themselves to be;—we, I say, who have heard this voice of warning, forerunning this second

[5] Warnings, pt. 3, pp, 31, 32.
[6] Warnings, pt. 3, p. 36.
[7] Ib., pt. 3, p. 66.

day of universal desolation and destruction of all opposers, and all unprepared; we who have as much reason to examine into the truth of it as any other mortal whatsoever; it being of that great moment and hazard to all to reject truth or to embrace error; and who have *diligently examined and tried it by the rules which God's word has laid down for the trial thereof*, and not by the rules of those pretended champions for truth, whose strength is to sit still; —we, I say, who have thus done with all that sincerity that a just concern for our own immortal souls could inspire us with, being well satisfied what we speak, and whereof we affirm, do, in compassion to a careless generation as well as in obedience to a divine command, publish to them the things that we have seen and heard; *the Holy Spirit having been pleased even already to attest to it more evidently than he did either to that voice of warning that went before the deluge or our Lord's appearance in the flesh; and in some powers not inferior to those given at the first planting of Christianity*, how much soever the scoffers who will not inquire into the truth of things may doubt of it."[8]

The other extract is from Dr. Josiah Woodward's tract on these prophets. He says, "The Holy Scriptures inform us, that the devil sometimes transformeth himself into the likeness of an angel of light: AND PERHAPS HE SCARCE EVER ACTED THAT PART MORE EXQUISITELY THAN IN THIS CASE. Persons are brought to put up prayers, and make exhortations, which are in most points very good and pious; humility, meekness, and charity, are recommended, and many other parts of religion duly represented."[9]

To show the powerful influence of such exhibitions at the time upon the minds of those who are present at them, though not of themselves disposed towards them, I close the

[8] Sir R. Bulkley's Preface to Warnings of the Eternal Spirit, by Abr. Whitro. Lond. 1709, 8vo. p. 2.

[9] Dr. Jos. Woodward's Remarks on the Modern Prophets. Lond. 1708. 8vo. p. 51.

account of these pretenders with the following extract from a remarkable narrative, published by a Mr. Henry Nicholson, who had been educated at Trinity College, Dublin, relating to himself, and connected with this case.

"Having," he says, "received a character of these prophets from a gentleman *whose judgment I honour*, and who had been imposed on by some who are prejudiced in their favour, with his advice to inquire into their lives and conversations, and examine their spirit, I became intimately acquainted with most of those who professed themselves inspired in this city . . . . As I was baptized in the Church of England . . . . so I have always been firm and unwavering in her doctrine . . . . But as these men *did not at first seem to assault any of my tenets in that point*, so they insensibly gained on my judgment to believe several things, which now, upon more serious consideration, I look upon as delusions." After frequenting their meetings for a few weeks, he says, "I was desired by one of the inspired, and withal enjoined to tell it to no one, to come the next day to a certain house at an appointed hour . . . Desiring to lose no opportunity of satisfying myself in this grand affair, I came a little after the appointed hour, where I found . . . . an assembly of at least twenty people. A person in the company, falling into the usual ecstatic motions, blest the rest, every one kneeling down, whilst the inspired person, laying both hands upon each party's head, pronounced their several blessings. I was persuaded (though unwilling, my conscience at the same time giving me some checks) to accept a blessing upon my knees, as I had seen the rest do; so I kneeled down to receive it, and these were the words which were spoken to me—'He that seeks shall find,' &c. . . . Immediately after the pronouncing of these words (whether my spirits were inflamed to an undue degree by *the heat of imagination* on so surprising an accident, or whether a *distinct being* from any thing in me was suffered by the Almighty to have power to *overrule my organs*, I cannot determine) I fell into violent convulsions . . . . I continued in this condition about a

quarter of an hour, when another inspired person in his ecstatic fits came to me as I stood on my feet, and said, 'Take heed, my child . . . But I will take care of thee. What thou hast further to do is to wait, praying for a fulfilling of those promises which yet remain; which shall, as sure as I am, be made good unto thee' . . . . Had I been in my right senses I might presently have perceived in these blessings something of that bait with which the old serpent covers the hook he designs to catch poor deceived souls withal, viz. flattery . . . . Neither do I see *what end there can be in such extraordinary promises, unless it be to blind a deceived soul, and hinder it from the proper exercise of humiliation and repentance*, which are prescribed and certain means of obtaining mercy, by inciting in it *such extravagant hopes of supernatural powers, just pouring down upon it.* Besides 'tis *a very great temptation to spiritual pride*, to raise in men, at their first approaches to them, *a confidence to pray for and expect such supernatural gifts* . . . . The next day in my closet, going to my private devotion, (I can't say my mind was free from those impressions which were made on me the day before by the temptation that was offered me *to pray for and desire God's supernatural gifts*,) I was seized with violent convulsions like the former . . . . In this fit I repeated often the words, *Lord Jesus*, so loud that I was heard all over the house. But by the constant use of a well composed form of prayer in my private devotions, and by serious frequenting of the public prayers, and a due receiving of the Lord's Supper, I found in a little time my convulsions abated, from which, I thank God, I am now perfectly free. 'Tis to be observed that all those who profess this new inspiration, say that their agitations constantly accompany their private devotions, and help them in their expressions by overruling their mouths. And perhaps this might have been my case, had I suffered my *imagination* to be led, as theirs apparently are, by an *intoxicated fancy*, which, as we may perceive in several other cases, inflames the animal spirits to an unna-

tural pitch; and the violent motions of the body serve to heat the agitated blood, and afford a constant supply of over-heated spirits to the nerves, to strengthen and carry on the violent agitations and delusive impressions; all which may be probably promoted by *evil spirits*. But upon my first vigorous resistance of this extravagance of fancy, or this officious spirit, I never after found myself assaulted in my prayers, but was free to go on either with my private or public devotion without interruption. Yet for the space of six weeks I could neither see any of the motions of the prophets, or even think of them, without some irregular motions caused by some such involuntary instigations as the nerves are affected withal when we behold a person yawning to imitate the motion we see in another."—"I will not deny, but do rather conceive, that in some of their ecstatic convulsions, they may be assisted by the immediate power of a *separate agent* from any thing in them; because some of their actions seem to be sometimes beyond the power of *mere nature*. But in their common and ordinary agitations I am verily persuaded they are carried by mere heat of fancy, and that they have power, if they please, to stop or forward those motions."—"We may see, and all the world may be satisfied, that these new prophets are not from God, by their *contradicting* one another in ecstasies by turns; *in which, also, they upbraid and condemn one another as false and self-exalting.*"[1]

The similarity of this case to some that we have lately witnessed is very remarkable, and such examples appear much to confirm the idea that these exhibitions are often produced by the "mere heat of fancy."

With these extracts I leave the consideration of this remarkable case, and the inferences to which it leads, with the reader.

With some of the followers of the French and English

[1] The Falsehood of the New Prophets manifested. By Henry Nicholson, formerly of Trinity College near Dublin. London, 1708, 8vo. pp. 7—18.

prophets originated the Shakers, who, leaving this country in 1774, passed over to America, where, in 1799, Dr. Dwight fell in with them in his travels. I subjoin a few extracts from his account of them. "The history of these people has, in a summary manner, been published by themselves in an octavo volume, entitled, 'The Testimony of Christ's Second Appearing;' the preface to which is subscribed by David Darrow, John Meacham, and Benjamin S. Youngs. It is supposed to have been written by a man whose name is Wells; who is said to have been educated to some extent, I know not how great, in learning and science. In the introduction of this work we are informed that 'a few of the French prophets came over to England about the year 1706. A few of the people' who became, it would seem, ultimately their followers at Bolton and Manchester in England, united themselves 'in a society under the special ministry of James and Jane Wardley.' These persons were both tailors by occupation, and of the sect of Quakers; 'but receiving the spirit of the French prophets, their testimony, according to what they saw by vision and revelation from God, was, that *the second appearing of Christ was at hand*, and that the Church was rising in her full and transcendent glory, which would effect the final downfall of Antichrist.' The meetings of these people were held alternately in Bolton and Manchester, and sometimes in Mayor-town. The manner of public devotion practised by them at these places was the following:—'Sometimes after assembling together, and sitting awhile in silent meditation, they were taken with a mighty trembling, under which they would express the indignation of God against all sin. At other times they were affected, *under the power of God*, with a mighty shaking; and were occasionally exercised in singing, shouting, or walking the floor, under the influence of spiritual signs, shoving each other about, or swiftly passing and repassing each other, like clouds agitated by a mighty wind.' From these strange exercises the people received the name of Shakers. 'The work which God promised to accomplish in the lat-

ter day,' they say, 'was eminently marked out by the prophets to be a work of shaking; and hence the name was very properly applied to the people who were both the subjects and instruments of the work of God in the latter day.' In confirmation of this opinion they quote a number of texts, which have no application to the subject, except that they contain the word 'shake.' . . . . . About the year 1770 we are informed that 'the present testimony of salvation and eternal life was fully opened, according to the special gift and revelation of God, through Anne Lee, that extraordinary woman, who at that time was received by their society as their spiritual mother.' This woman was born at Manchester, in England. Her father, John Lee, was a blacksmith. Her husband, Abraham Stanley, was also a blacksmith. She was a cutter of hatters' fur. About the year 1758 she joined herself to the society of Shakers; 'and there, by her perfect obedience to all that she was taught, attained to the full knowledge and experience of those who stood in the foremost light.' Still, it seems, 'finding in herself the seeds or remains of human depravity, and a lack of the Divine nature, she was frequently in such extreme agony of soul, that, clinching her hands together, the blood would flow through the pores of her skin.' . . . From '*the light and power of God which attended her ministry* she was received and acknowledged as the first *mother* or spiritual parent in the line of the female' . . . . She set sail for America in the spring of 1774 with a number of her followers . . . . . Mother remained in New York, as we are informed, almost two years. She then went to Albany, and thence in the following September to Nisqueuna . . . . She predicted in the boldest terms that the world would be destroyed at a given time; if I remember right, the year 1783. . . . She also professed that she was able to work miracles, and that she was endued with the power of speaking with tongues in the manner recorded of the apostles. Pretensions to miraculous powers at this period excite not only in persons of intelligence, but in most men of sober thought, indig-

nation or contempt. In ignorant persons, especially those who have warm feelings and lively imaginations, they awaken wonder, alarm, and ultimately confidence. With the aid of a cunning, which levels its efforts directly at their degree of understanding, *a ready voluble eloquence*, and a *solemn air of mystery*, such pretenders have usually made considerable impressions on persons of this character. Among those who assembled to hear her teach, she persuaded a small number to admit her pretensions, the sanctity of her character, and the reality of her mission from God. To these people she appears to have taught a doubtful reverence for the Bible, blended with a superior veneration for her own dictates. Wherever it sanctioned, or was supposed to sanction, her own instructions, she seems to have appealed to it with readiness as to conclusive authority. Such is evidently the conduct of her followers; but wherever it directly opposes their system, and conveys a meaning which rejects every equivocal comment, they pass it by in silence. To enthusiasts of all countries and nations, mystery has been the universal, as well as absolutely necessary, resort in every difficulty; and the trick, though almost endlessly exposed, is still played off with the same success . . . . . The book [containing their doctrines] is divided into eight parts; *four parts of which, together with many passages in other parts, are employed in railing at various classes of Christians, particularly those who have been generally denominated orthodox, both in ancient and modern times.* . . . . . The style of the work is grave, remarkably abstract and mysterious; and the doctrines, taken together, a singular combination of mysticism. The spirit with which it is written is vain, arrogant, and self-righteous. . . . . When Mother commenced her exhortations at Nisqueuna, the extraordinary nature of her pretensions, the novelty of her doctrines, *and the zeal and confidence* with which she urged them, soon became objects of attention. *A number of people were allured to this spot by curiosity, others were impelled by enthusiasm and religious expectation, if I may be allowed*

the phrase; an indefinite apprehension that something new in religion, something peculiarly important, something on which the spirit of wonder could fasten, something which would better satisfy their own wishes than any thing which they had found elsewhere, might be derived from the instructions of Anne Lee. Out of this class she soon gained a number of adherents from various parts of the country. . . . . . Among their other early peculiarities this was one, that they were always under the immediate and inspiring guidance of the Spirit of God . . . . . Within a few years after the establishment was formed at Nisqueuna, another was begun at New-Lebanon ; a third, as I have been told, at Jericho, in the county of Berkshire; and a fourth at Enfield, in Connecticut. There are, I believe, some other establishments of these people in this part of the American Union, and some others upon the Ohio. Each of these is under the administration of one or more individuals who possess what they call the leading gift. . . . . Among themselves they are said to be very harmonious and friendly, and in their treatment of others to be fair, sincere, and obliging. In seasons when the yellow fever has prevailed in New York, they have distinguished themselves by very honourable and liberal donations to the poor of that city. Incredible as it may seem, one is tempted from the apparent sincerity of these people in other cases, to *believe them sincere in the adoption of those mental vagaries by which they are distinguished as a religious society.* They profess, and appear to believe, that they are regularly inspired in their worship; that they are enabled to speak and to sing in UNKNOWN LANGUAGES; that they derive their sentiments, their knowledge, their devotion, their unnatural actions, and even their tunes, from the same divine source. . . . In their worship these people sung in what they called an 'unknown language.' It was a succession of unmeaning sounds frequently repeated, half articulated, and plainly gotten by heart, for they all uttered the same sounds in succession. The tune with which they were at this time

inspired was 'Nancy Dawson.' . . . . These people confidently informed me, as a proof that their fraternity possessed miraculous powers, that they had restored the broken limb of a youth at that time living in Enfield. I was soon after at Enfield, and was informed by some of the respectable inhabitants, that the friends of this youth, who were Shakers, had been induced by the importunities of their brethren to trust his cure to their prayers, instead of committing him, as they intended, to the care of a surgeon. The use of the limb was lost, and the patient's health ruined. *The power of working miracles* they still claim; and in the book which I have so often mentioned, a number of instances are produced in which the effects of these powers are said to have been realized by several members of the fraternity. The writer expressly says, that 'the gifts of healing, working of miracles, prophesying, discerning of spirits, divers kinds of tongues, the interpreting of tongues, &c. have been abundantly ministered through Mother and the first witnesses; and from them to others, and frequently used on various occasions.' Ten instances in which persons have professedly been healed of various wounds and diseases are recorded. . . . *The witnesses are all Shakers. . . . . They professed, not only that Mother was perfect, but that a considerable number at least of the fraternity were perfect also.* . . . . The industry, manual skill, fair dealing, and orderly behaviour of the brotherhood, render them useful members of society. I ought to add, that Mother was boldly pronounced by them to be immortal. But after 'she was taken out of their sight in the ordinary way of all living,' this magnificent story, of which she was undoubtedly the author, was told no more. Had Christ uttered such a declaration concerning himself, and it had terminated in the same manner, it would have ruined all his pretensions in a moment. But this event has never disturbed the faith of the Shakers at all."—In the following chapter Dr. Dwight gives some extracts from a book published by one who left them, showing the extravagancies and improprieties to which such sentiments lead.

They are governed entirely by the revelations said to be made to their elders, and expect "that the time will arrive when *creatures will not dare to contradict the gift of God*," that is, as Dr. Dwight observes, "when men will not dare to contradict them, their opinions, or their orders."[2]

In 1823 (for matters have been so well managed by the leaders of this sect that it has actually lasted to the present time,) an account of this sect was published in America by one of themselves, entitled, The Millennial Church. At that time it had in various parts of America sixteen stations. Of the effects of the divine inspiration in Mother we are told, "At times, when under the operation of the Holy Ghost, her countenance shone with the glory of God, and her form and actions appeared divinely beautiful and very angelic. *The power and influence of her spirit at such times was great beyond description;* and no one was able to gainsay or resist the authority with which she spoke." "Her soul was frequently inspired with such divine efficacy, that with a single word or touch of her hand she would often raise individuals, and many times, with a few words, a whole assembly, from a state of deep distress and tribulation of soul, to a state of great heavenly joy and comfort. Again, she has often ministered, in a few words, to a large assembly, such a measure of the power of conviction and repentance, that in a few minutes the floor has been wet with tears." In this book are recorded, also, accounts of various miracles and visions with which Mother and her followers were favoured.

What, however, is very remarkable, is, that (in connexion with other doctrines, which Mr. Irving and his party would disclaim with abhorrence,) they hold the very doctrines he has advanced respecting the human nature of Christ, and the perfectibility of the believer's holiness. Respecting the former, their doctrine is,—"Though Jesus Christ had a miraculous birth, yet 'he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his

[2] Dwight's Travels in New England and New York, vol. iii. pp. 137—157.

brethren.' Hence it appears that nothing was excepted, not even the death of the fall. It is therefore evident that he was born into a fallen nature, with all its propensities. This nature he received, through the medium of his natural birth, of the Virgin Mary; therefore he necessarily had a progressive travel out of it. And by yielding obedience to the will of his heavenly Parents, he overcame the power of that death which reigned in the fallen nature of man, and rose triumphant out of it." Respecting the latter they say,—" The doctrine of Christian sinners, or the idea of Christians living in sin, so strenuously advocated by many, is utterly inconsistent with every attribute of God. All doctrines which imply that real Christians cannot live without sin, are inconsistent with the attributes of power and goodness, and indeed with every divine attribute. 'Whosoever abideth in him, sinneth not,' &c. The opinion which prevails so extensively among mankind, that no man, not even a real Christian, is able to live without committing sin, is one of the most destructive errors that ever proceeded from the powers of darkness. It strikes directly against a life of holiness, and is calculated to discourage all attempts in the pursuit of virtue; for what inducement can any man have to pursue that which he believes it impossible to obtain?"

Before we proceed to the next chapter, I would call the reader's attention for a few minutes to the *principal marks* by which such cases as those we have been considering, seem to be generally characterized; adding under them a few more examples illustrative of them in particular. They are all spurious imitations of the characteristics of the true prophets, varying in their degree of verisimilitude, according to the ability, as we may suppose, of the agent that produces them, be it human enthusiasm or satanic power.

We may observe, then, *first;* that such prophets have almost invariably been distinguished by the characteristic of speaking as the mere passive organs of utterance to a superior power by an involuntary and constrained use of

the bodily organs, and without the *instrumental intervention* of the mind, and frequently unconscious of what they uttered. This is sufficiently shown in the cases we have given above.[3] Such, also, we may add, was the case with the heathen soothsayers. The similarity, in this respect, between them and the false prophets among Christians was long ago observed by the early Christian Fathers, and is noticed in the passages given above, in the preceding chapter, from Origen and Chrysostom, as one important particular in which the false differed from the true prophets. That such was the nature of the pretended inspirations of the heathen soothsayers, we have abundant evidence from the heathen writers themselves. Plato says,—"the soothsayers, and those who utter the divine oracles, understand nothing of what they say."[4] The well-known description of the Cumæan Sybil under her inspirations, by Virgil, is strikingly descriptive of such scenes as our present prophets,[5] and several of the examples mentioned above,[6] have exhibited as the effect of the Holy Spirit's influences. I quote the translation of Dryden;—

> Struggling in vain, impatient of her load,
> And lab'ring underneath the pond'rous god,
> The more she strove to shake him from her breast,
> With more and far superior force he press'd;
> Commands his entrance, and, without control,
> *Usurps her organs* and inspires her soul.[7]

Can words describe better the modern "manifestations?"

[3] Some of the Camisars and of their followers here, as Mr. Lacy, professed to understand *at the time* what they said under inspiration, though not to have it impressed upon their minds, so as to remember it; but even this was not the case with most of them. So among the modern claimants Mr. Baxter appears to consider himself to have been *generally* conscious at the time of what he was saying. But this was not always the case. In none of these cases, also, was there any instrumental intervention of the mind; and in all of them, to speak as the passive organs of the spirit's utterance was considered a *necessary* evidence of their being really inspired.

[4] Ὁι θεομαντεις και ὁι χρησμωδοι . . . . . ισασι ουδεν ὡν λεγουσι. Plat. Apol. Socr.

[5] See pp. 19, 20; 22, 23, &c. above.

[6] See pp. 160, 162, 171, &c. above.

[7] At Phœbi nondum patiens immanis in antro
Bacchatur vates, magnum si pectore possit

And, not to multiply such passages unnecessarily,[8] we may observe that even the heathen themselves were cautious in admitting such prophets, for Plato tells us,[9] that it was not allowed that the inspired person should be himself the judge of what he uttered when in a state of frenzy; but that the law appointed certain *discreet* judges to decide whether his inspirations were to be received as genuine or not. Nay, some of the wiser among the heathen themselves have left on record their dissatisfaction in this matter. "What authority," says Cicero, "has that frenzy which you call divine; that a madman should see those things which a wise man cannot see, and that he who has lost his human senses should have become possessed of divine? We speak of the verses of the Sybil, which she is said to have uttered in a state of frenzy."[1]

It is at least certain, therefore, that these characteristics have long been the marks of false prophets; and it has been already proved, that they were not attendants on those *known* to be true.[2]

We may observe, *secondly*, That such pretensions have been not unfrequently attended with a professed power of speaking in languages previously unknown to the party, and that in a way superior to what the modern pretenders have practised, because there have been those who have spoken real acknowledged languages; and that this alleged gift, as used or enjoyed by such pretenders, has always been a gift of an unnecessary and even useless kind, causing them to speak only in languages foreign both to themselves and their hearers, when their own language, and even that alone, would be intelligible to both.

> Excussisse Deum; tanto magis ille fatigat
> Os rabidum, fera corda domans, *fingitque premendo.*
>
> Virg. Æn. 6. vv. 77—80.

[8] See Jambl. de Myst. sect. 3. c. iv. Plutarch. de Pyth. Orac. See also J. Smith's Select Discourses, pp. 197, 8.

[9] Plato in Timæo.

[1] Quid vero habet auctoritatis furor iste quem divinum vocatis, ut quæ sapiens non videat ea videat insanus, et is qui humanos sensus amiserit divinos assecutus sit? Sybillæ versus observamus quos illa furens fudisse dicitur. Cicer. De Divin. l. 2. c. 54.

[2] See pp. 69—102, above.

To account for the utterance of sounds which no one can recognize as forming a regular language, appears to me, I confess, a matter that presents but little difficulty; but when an assertion is made in the knowledge that a *negative* cannot be *proved*, it is better, if possible, to meet an opponent on his own ground. Assuming, then, that what our supposed modern prophets have spoken is a language, it may still be replied, that its utterance by them is no more than what many other false prophets and deluded persons have done before. This has been already illustrated in the case of the French and English prophets; and (if we believe their own account) in that of the Shakers of America. The female who was the first head of their party, was said by them to speak "seventy-two languages, which, though not understood by the living, were quite intelligible to the dead."[3] And her followers "believe . . . that they speak with divers kinds of tongues in their public assemblies; and this they think is done by the influence of the Holy Spirit."[4]

Now, so far from the power of speaking in a language unknown to the speaker, being of itself any sign of a divine agency in that person, it has been generally set down as one sign of a dæmoniac. "In all good authors," says one of the writers already quoted, "that have written concerning possession by evil spirits, speaking with tongues is laid down as one sign of a dæmoniac."[5]

Accordingly, in Richard Baxter's "Certainty of the World of Spirits," to prove the existence of an evil spirit, there is, among other accounts, a letter from the Duke of Lauderdale to Baxter, dated 1659, in which he gives a story of a poor untaught Scotch woman, who was considered by

[3] Jones's Dict. of Religious Opinions. Ed. 1818. p. 229.

[4] Ibid. p. 230.

[5] Hutchinson's Short View, &c. p. 17. The same is more particularly observed as to the use of strange and barbarous words. It has been generally laid down by writers on the subject as a mark of dæmoniacal agency, "if words are made use of that are unknown, false, apocryphal, absurd, or incoherent." (Si adhibeantur verba ignota, falsa, apocrypha, absurda, nihil cohærentia.) Del Rii Disquis. Mag. p. 50. Ed. Lugd. 1612, fol.

persons of piety and learning, (the well-known John Weems among others,) as decidedly possessed, from her occasionally uttering Latin; and it is added, "Within these thirty or forty years there was an unquestionable possession in the United Provinces: a wench that spoke all languages, of which I have heard many particulars when I lived in the Low Countries."[6] To which Baxter adds, in another part, the weight of his own opinion that such exhibitions are the effects of satanic possession, and observes, that "Sir Theodore Mayerne, the greatest physician of England, to divers kings," says, in p. 57 of his Praxis, "By two signs I can know dæmoniacks," one of which is, "if a person untaught speak in divers and strange tongues."[7]

"There have been," adds Baxter, in a subsequent part, "many enthusiastics that Satan hath notoriously deluded by pretended angelical revelation for some *great increase of knowledge.* You may find many sad instances in Epiphanius and other histories of the old heretics. *And few ages since have been without some such.*"[8]

We have, also, many examples left on record by physicians and others, of languages unknown to the speaker being spoken by their patients, through the power of an evil spirit, when labouring under the influence of disease, brought on, as some have supposed, by the agency of Satan, or, according to others, by natural causes. Respecting such instances, the following remarks of the learned Meric Casaubon are worth considering. "To all these natural diseases and distempers," he says, after enumerating phrensy, epilepsy, &c. "enthusiastic divinatory fits are incidental. I do not say that it doth happen very often; that is not material, whether often or seldom; but when it doth happen, as the disease is cured by natural means, so the enthusiasms go away, I will not say by the same means, but at the same time. That is certain by frequent experience, and by the acknowledgment of best

[6] R. Baxter's "Certainty of the World of Spirits," pp. 83—85.
[7] Ibid. pp. 120, 121.
[8] Ibid. p. 175.

physicians, Sennertus, Peucerus, and divers others, whom I could name. These men and women, which, when they were sick of those diseases, did foretell divers things which came to pass accordingly, and some of them (which I think more wonderful, as more remote from natural causes) had spoken some Latin, some Greek, some Hebrew, or any other language, whereof before they had no use nor skill; when once cured of those diseases they return to their former simplicity and ignorance. This is granted by all. Whereupon some, as Levinus Lemnius (De Occul. Nat. Mir. l. 2. c. 2,) particularly, do peremptorily conclude that no other cause of such accidents is to be sought, but natural. '*Quos ego pronuncio*,' saith he, '*non a malo infestoque Genio divexari, nec Dæmonis instinctu impulsuve, sed vi morbi humorumque ferocia*,' &c. And he doth endeavour to give some reason, from the nature of the soul, &c. how such a thing might happen naturally. But his reasons are no ways satisfactory. And that these extraordinary operations do rather proceed from the Devil, to me is a great argument, (besides other reasons,) *because the very self-same things are known to happen to divers that are immediately possest, without any bodily distemper other than the very possession*, which must needs affect the body more or less."—"To pass by divers relations of later times upon the credit (some of them at least) of very creditable authors and witnesses, I shall content myself with the testimony of one, a man of exquisite learning, and a curious sifter of the truth in doubtful points . . . . Georgius Raguseius is the man; whose words in his second book, *De Divinatione*, Epist. 11. *De oraculis*, are; *Novi ego Venetiis pauperem quandam mulierem*, &c., that is, 'I have known at Venice a certain poor woman which was possest; sometimes she would be stupid and sottish; sometimes she did speak with divers tongues, and discourse of things belonging to the mathematics and philosophy, yea, and to divinity. I do not write here what I have heard from others, but myself have disputed with her more than once. Thus he."——"As for them who in those distempers are

reported to have spoken languages before unknown unto them, because I see that some, otherwise learned and ingenuous, are not very prone to believe it, it being a thing in very deed liable to much imposture; although I do not see what can be expected or objected against this one, were there no other, this one example, I say, which we have here out of Raguseius; yet to give the reader, in a matter of such importance, some further satisfaction; to let that pass, which, durst I trust my memory when I was so young, I could say of a woman possest in Sedan, where I then lived and went to school, that spake Hebrew, and familiarly discoursed in her fits with some skilful in that language; to let that pass, I say, because I dare not trust my memory; what can any man, rational and discreet, answer to that which *Fernelius*, a man so learned and religious, and by profession a physician, yea, so great and famous a physician, as had generally the name of the first and chiefest of his time, doth relate of his own knowledge and experience, in his 2nd book, *De abditis rerum causis*, c. xvi. of one that was his patient, and not his only, but of divers other learned physicians who were entertained about him at the same time, and all joined in the cure; by all whom he was heard to speak Greek in his fits, which otherwise was altogether unknown unto him. *Forestus*, also, in his *Observations*, lib. 10, c. 19, from several authors hath divers examples; not to name *Langius*, *Wierius*, and others, physicians all of fame and credit. *Cornelius a Lapide*, a learned commentator of good account among Protestants and Papists, upon the 11th of Genesis, (if my collections deceive me not, for I have not the book at this time,) beareth witness, that divers *anabaptists*, (a name so general that it may include the most notorious sectaries of our times,) *bolo et symbolo Diaboli accepto*, that is, as I understand him, when by the instinct of the devil, though upon pretence commonly of great holiness and piety, they have entered themselves into that profession, *Græce interdum et Hebraice statim loquuntur*, *&c. they*, some of them, *begin presently to speak, some Greek, some Hebrew, and to*

interpret the Scripture. Psellus, a very learned man and philosopher, a great writer, in a treatise of his, Περι ενεργειας δαιμονων, that is, *Of the Power*, or *Operation, of Devils and Dæmons*, hath a very particular relation of a woman that was possest, and in her fits spake the Armenian tongue very readily, to which, being a Grecian, she was otherwise altogether a stranger. These instances, I hope, in this place, may suffice."[9] In a subsequent part of the work he mentions a case somewhat similar in its circumstances, but which, he says, proved a counterfeit. "In 1599, was brought to Paris, in France, a certain maid named Martha, . . . which was supposed to be possessed. She did many things to make the world think so. Strange gestures and convulsions, or convulsive motions rather, she had at command; and sometimes she was heard to speak strange languages, but that was but sometimes and sparingly, which gave occasion of suspicion that she was a counterfeit." "The whole city," however, was much "divided about it;" but "the conclusion was, that Martha was found to be a mere counterfeit."[1]

The case mentioned above from Fernelius is stated by him to have been one in which a young man was suffering under what appeared to him at first to be in all respects epilepsy, except that his intellect was unimpaired; and he adds,—"It was discovered first in the third month that an evil spirit was the cause of the whole evil, betraying himself in the voice, and in unusual words and sentences of Latin and Greek, although the patient was ignorant of the Greek language."[2]

The two following are perhaps as extraordinary cases of

[9] Mer. Casaubon's Treatise concerning Enthusiasm. 2nd Edition. London, 1656. 8vo. pp. 36—41.

[1] Ibid. pp. 75—77.

[2] "Mense tertio primum deprehensus dæmon quidam totius mali author, voce insuetisque verbis ac sententiis tum Latinis tum Græcis (quanquam ignarus linguæ Græcæ laborans esset) se prodens." Fernel. De abd. rer. caus. lib. 2. c. 16. Ed. 1560. pp. 372, 3. It is quoted by Baxter in his Cert. of World of Spirits, pp. 119, 20. See also on cases of this kind, J. Vossius De Idol. l. 3. c. 44.

this kind as any lover of wonders can desire. The first is extracted from the Polyhistor of Morhof. "I cannot," he says, "here pass over the wonderful and memorable example of a Frenchman mentioned by La Mothe le Vayer, in the second vol. of his French works, epist. 61. p. 657, who, in whatever language he was interrogated, could, in his sleep, give an answer in the same, although, besides French, he had only a slight knowledge of Italian and Spanish. His name was Le Fevre, and he dwelt at Rouen." After mentioning his being tried with Cingalese and other languages, he adds, "When he was awake, he could remember nothing that he had done." [3]

The other is thus related by Dr. Woodward, in his book on the French and English prophets. "I have particular acquaintance with a gentlewoman, now in this city, who had in some part of her life frequent appearances of a spirit to her, in a glorious transparent brightness, and with a pleasing, rather than affrighting, countenance. And that we may have no room to impute this to the speculations of fancy, the spirit guided her hand to write many things in Greek, Hebrew, and Dutch, and all these very correctly, though she knew nothing of them. His usual discourse with her savoured of piety, and as she was once dressing herself at the glass, he gave her a caution against pride. This continued several months, and when some learned men desired to see her write under the guidance of this spirit, he bid her appoint them to come at an hour he named, and they should see the *thing*, though not the *agent*, which was done accordingly. But the end was, that this gentlewoman, who was virtuously educated and of pious dispositions, found herself nothing edified thereby, but manifestly puffed up, ready to *contemn her parents*, and to *despise advice from any one*. Upon which she betook herself more seriously to prayer,

[3] D. G. Morhofii Polyhistor Literarius. Ed. 4. Lubec. 1747. 4to. Vol. 1. lib. 2, c. 9, s. 28, p. 248. Other cases, he tells us, may be found in Huarte, ["Examen de Ingeniis," published in English by R. Carew, under title of "The examination of Men's Wits." Lond. 1594. 4to. reprinted 1604 and 1616,] and Pomponatius De Incantationibus.

and to the plain paths of Christian duty, and was, in a short time, freed from the dangerous familiarity with unknown spirits." [4]

Whether these cases are to be accounted for by any remarkable combination of natural causes, or from a real satanic possession, which I think in *some* of them not very unlikely,[5] it is unnecessary here to inquire; but it is quite evident, and this is the point I would wish the reader to notice, that the mere fact of a person speaking in languages he has never learnt, is no proof of Divine influence, and has frequently occurred, if we regard the testimony of many most competent witnesses, in those who were undeniably *not* under that influence.

"There are many well-attested cases," says Bishop Warburton, "in modern history, although we should argue that they have lost nothing of the marvellous in the telling, where enthusiasts, in their ecstasies, have talked very fluently in the learned languages, of which they had a very imperfect knowledge in their sober intervals. . . . And it is remarkable that instances of this kind have occurred so frequently that Thyræus, a famous Popish exorcist, blinded as he was by the superstitious impiety of demoniacal possessions, has, in his *Directory*, expressly declared it to be the common opinion of his brotherhood, that the speaking strange languages is no certain sign of a possession, and warns the exorcist against this illusion." [6]

Where, then, lies the difference between such cases and that of the early inspired Christians? Clearly and strikingly in this—that in the former the languages were spoken to those who at least did not require the use of a language foreign to the speaker, and often to those who did not understand it, and therefore, as most will think, unnecessarily and to no purpose; and in the latter *confessedly* the gift

[4] Dr. J. Woodward's Remarks on the modern prophets. Lond. 1708. 8vo. p. 26.

[5] See Spencer's Vanity of Vulg. Proph. pp. 108, 9.

[6] Works, vol. 8, p. 258.

of languages was bestowed for the purpose of qualifying the recipients to give instruction to those who spoke them; and they who used this gift to those who did not need it, *fell under an apostolic rebuke for so doing.*"[7]

When, therefore, our modern pretenders to the gift can find some nation whose language they are able to speak without previous study, and will preach the gospel to them in it, they will then, and not till then, place themselves in a situation capable of comparison with that of the early Christians; but in the useless obtrusion upon their hearers of languages unknown to them, and still more of unknown sounds, they only betray a forgetfulness of the real spirit of Christianity.

It is to be noticed, *thirdly*, That such pretensions have been often attended with an alleged power of working miracles, particularly of healing; and some of them such, that it would be impossible to *disprove* that they required *supernatural* power.

The above cases abound, as we have seen, with examples of these things; and were we to admit such manifestations as proofs of a Divine mission, we should be obliged to admit the claims of one half at least of the heretics that have, from the first, harassed the Church of Christ, nay, even of the idols of the heathen. For how many do we find, of the *antient* heretics in particular, who claimed and *appeared* to work miracles?[8] And their claims, be it observed, were not in general disputed by the early Christian Fathers on the ground that they were not true in respect of the miracles themselves, or that the wonderful works they pretended to have wrought were *not* wrought by them, but on grounds independent of the *fact*. The mode of judging with the Fathers whether alleged miracles were divine or not, was by comparing the *ends* and *purposes* for

[7] 1 Cor. xiv.

[8] See Epiph. Adv. Hæres. *passim*, and particularly against the Simonians, hær. 9. Also, Sozomen. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 14; and, Theodorit. Hæret. Fab., De Novat., &c.

which they were wrought with those which the confessedly divine miracles had in view. They teach us therefore to distinguish divine miracles from others, by considering whether they are conducive *to the salvation of souls*,[9] whether they are *useful and profitable to mankind*,[1] and above all, whether they are *exhibited in support of doctrines that are agreeable to the written word of God*.[2] The Church of Rome has her miracles to boast of, and many of them are as well attested and remarkable as any that the Church of Christ has seen since the days of the apostles;[3] and were we to lay aside the *test* just mentioned, and even to strike out nine tenths of them as mere lying legends, we should still have a sufficient number of stubborn facts left to give the stamp of truth to her corruptions of the Christian faith. The Turkish devotees also make the same claim.[4]

The heathen themselves wanted not abundant proof of this kind, of the truth of their own superstitions. Many remarkable instances of miracles performed among them, are mentioned not only by heathen authors,[5] but by Clement of Alexandria,[6] Lactantius,[7] Tertullian,[8] and other Christian writers, and which, for the most part, were condemned not

[9] Origen. Contr. Cels. lib. 2. Aug. De Civit. Dei, l. 10. c. 16.

[1] Ib. lib. 3.

[2] See Iren. Adv. Hær. lib. 1. cc. 8, 9, 12; and lib. ii. cc. 57, 58; Tertull. De Præscript. c. 44; and Aug. De Civit. Dei, l. 10. c. 16. &c. &c. And see Orig. Contr. Cels. lib. 1, where he meets the objection of Celsus to Christ's miracles, grounded on those performed by magicians and such like.

[3] See J. Lipsii Diva virgo Hallensis. Ant. 1604. In Engl. 1688. 4to.; H. Tursellini Histor. D. Virg. Lauretanæ. Mog. 1600. 8vo. Col. Agr. 1622. 8vo. In Engl. 1608. 8vo.; Nider. De Visionibus et Revelationibus. Helmst. 1691. 8vo. R. Sheldon's Survey of the Romish Miracles. Lond. 1616. 4to.; Bp. Stillingfleet's Second Disc. in Vind. of Grounds of Prot. Faith. c. 3.; Ware's Hunting of the Romish Fox. Dubl. 1683. 8vo. c. 5. Account of the miracle wrought at Paris on the person of Anne Charlie. Lond. 1728. 8vo. &c. &c.

[4] See Septem-Castrens: De Mor. et Rel. Turc. c. 14.

[5] Jambl. De Myster. Oxon. 1678. sect. 3. c. 4. p. 64, Sueton. De Vespas. and many others.

[6] Strom. lib. 6.

[7] De Orig. Error. lib. 2. §. 7.

[8] Apologet. Adv. Gent.

by a denial of the fact, but only by the test already mentioned.

Nay, we have our Lord's own assurance that many will plead before him at the last day, a time surely when a known falsehood would hardly escape the lips, that they have prophesied in his name, and in his name done *many wonderful works*, and yet he will profess unto them—not that this was not the case, but—that, notwithstanding all this, he never knew them. (Matt. vii. 22, 23.)

It is indeed probable, that there are some miracles which God does not permit to be in the power of any created agent to effect, and if any such exist, the power of life and death seems to be particularly of this kind; but when such a case as that mentioned above, p. 164, comes before us, it immediately suggests the consideration, whether such effects may not *appear* in some cases to be produced where only natural causes are at work; and still more, whether the imitative power of Satan is not sufficient to deceive men, and alas! *Christian* men, in such things. The observation is drawn from simple and indisputable facts; and hence the conclusion seems to follow, that the exhibition of miracles is one of those things that are to be considered rather as *probable attendants* upon true prophets, than as independent *proofs* of their divine mission.[8]

Fourthly, we may observe that such pretensions have *often* been attended with much evidence of sanctity in the conduct of their propagators, and have had the support of persons eminent for their learning and piety.

The garb and semblance of holiness have *always* attended them—but I am speaking here of upright and sincere persons. That many such have been misled by them is, I

[8] Of course the word *miracle* is used here in its strict and proper sense, as meaning *a wonderful work, a work that excites wonder from its appearing supernatural*; and after all the laboured and discordant definitions that have been given of the word, the writer cannot but think it best to use it always in this its *proper* sense, as there is no greater source of confusion and mistake in treating on such subjects, than in using words to signify more than they really mean, which makes the *arbitrary* additions to their meaning as numerous and dissonant as the views of the writers using them.

think, sufficiently evident from the examples already mentioned. If any further proof were needed, examples in abundance are at hand, and even of cases where the pretensions made were, if possible, still more absurd and extravagant than in those already mentioned. Witness the case of Richard Brothers, at the end of the last century, whose supposed divine mission was made the subject of a motion in the House of Commons, and supported by some of the most respectable and intelligent members; and respecting whom, for two or three years, the press teemed with publications. Becoming at last actually troublesome to the Government by his political prophecies, he was humanely placed under medical care; and, when sobered, he recanted and regretted his vagaries.[9] Another still more remarkable case is that of Joanna Southcott, which lasted for many years, and whose followers, at the time of her death in 1814, amounted to about TWENTY THOUSAND, pervading every county in England, and numbering among them many persons of the highest respectability, piety, and intelligence, including FIVE CLERGYMEN OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH, AND MANY DISSENTING MINISTERS; AND HAD FIVE CHAPELS IN AND NEAR THE METROPOLIS ALONE. She herself died under the delusion, which was so firmly rooted in the minds of a vast number of her followers, that they did not abandon it for several years after her death, expecting her speedy resurrection.[1]

It is painful to have to enumerate cases of this kind, but the tenacity with which many cling to the idea that God would not suffer persons, really sincere and pious, who have made the matter a subject of prayer with him, to be deceived in such a thing, renders it necessary to show—and I know nothing that can more fully show it than such cases as those already mentioned—that it is *quite untenable*.

Fifthly; we may observe, that such claimants have all been distinguished by remarkable fluency and power in

[9] Hughson's Hist. of Relig. Impost. Lond. 1814. 12mo. sub. fin.

[1] See J. Grant's Hist. of the English Church, vol. ii. pp. 445, &s.; and vol. iii. Preface; and Hughson's Hist. of Religious Impostures.

prayer and preaching, so as to excite the wonder and admiration of their hearers. We may notice this especially in the cases of those who were patronized by Comenius, and of the French and English prophets; and, as much stress is often laid on this, I shall refer to it more fully hereafter, only adding here in a note some references, to which the reader, who is so disposed, may apply for several cases illustrative of this matter.[2]

Sixthly; it is to be observed, that a very general characteristic of such pretenders, is, their making the reception or rejection of their pretended gifts the *chief* mark of distinction between the spiritual and nominal followers of Christ, and hurling bitter denunciations and prophecies of destruction against *all* who reject them; while at the same time, feeling the weakness of the external evidence in their favour, they ground their conviction and proof of them upon some internal light, some feeling of sympathy and assurance, they themselves have been led to entertain respecting them. This is particularly marked in the cases of the Montanists and the English and French prophets; and the language used in those two instances, on this subject, has been *repeated* in a most remarkable manner, almost word for word, by the present claimants.

Lastly; it is remarkable that in almost all the claimants to inspiration, for some centuries past, the great burden of their prophetic message has been, that *the second advent of Christ*, with its consequences, either in the immediate establishment of the millennium, or in the dissolution of the world, according as they believed would be the case, is *just at hand*.[3]

The very *matter* of such a prophecy seems to give it at once a plausibility; for, as its propagators always say, what subject is there more calculated to rouse men to a sense of

[2] See Lucian. L. De Condit. ver. Hist. sub. init. *de Abderitis*; Septem-Castrens. De mor. et rel. Turc. c. 15; Brukneri Litt. ad Breithaupt. Tenzel. Coll. M. A. 1692. p. 631; Gerdes. De Enthus. c. ii. s. i. § 14.

[3] The strictly literal interpretation of the prophecies relating to the millennium has been adopted by most of them; including, of course, the doctrine of the second coming of Christ preceding the millennium.

their danger, give them a more glorious view of the privileges and hopes of the Christian, and thus promote holiness of life? But when we look back to the past history of the Church of Christ, the question seems at once to arise—Do facts and past experience justify this opinion? Surely not. The cases already mentioned seem to disprove it, for no such effects have hitherto attended such announcements. And to me, I confess, it appears not difficult to account for this failure, on the ground, that if you wish to give a man a *motive* for action, you must offer him a foundation for his hopes that does not admit of doubt and uncertainty. The suspicion that hangs over *one* part of the message will, in the mind of the hearer, affect the whole; and Satan's purposes will often be effected by those whose intentions are quite the contrary. It is to be observed that *our Lord's* argument for watchfulness, is taken from the *uncertainty* of the time: "Take ye heed, watch and pray, *for* ye know *not* when the time is."[4] Such an admonition as this, will at least be treated with respect by all who profess to receive the gospel. But let a man reverse the motive and say, "Watch, for the coming of Christ will certainly be in two or three years," and it is more than probable that the only result will be a denial of the fact, and therefore a neglect of the admonition. I do not believe it, men will say, and I can trust neither you nor myself to be so confident an interpreter of prophecy, when I know that so many wiser and better have egregiously deceived themselves and others in this very matter. Certain it is, that both our Lord[5] and his apostles[6] exhort us to take heed of unauthorized announcements of this kind. And the bad effect of such admonitions, much as is always said of their tendency to promote holiness, is distinctly shown in the words used by St. Paul on the subject,—"We beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon *shaken in mind*, or

[4] Mark xiii. 33, 35; and so in Matt. xxiv. 42, 44.

[5] Matt. xxiv. 4, 6, 11, 23, 24. Mark xiii. 5—8, 21—23,

[6] 2 Thess. ii. 1—3; iii. 5.

be *troubled*, neither by *spirit*, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand."

Such, however, there have been in almost every period of the Christian Church, to an almost inconceivable number, and made often with an assurance that ridiculed contradiction, in some cases by supposed prophetic inspiration, and in others by interpretation of the prophecies of Scripture.

Of their presence in the Church in the times of the apostles, the words of St. Paul, already quoted, are a proof. I will add a *very few* instances, out of the hundreds that might be given, of their occurrence in the intervening ages of the Church, from that period to the present time.

Hippolytus the Martyr, who flourished at the commencement of the third century, proves entirely to his own satisfaction that Christ was born in the year 5500, (an opinion not uncommon with the Fathers,) and that, consequently, as it was "necessary" that six thousand years should be fulfilled, and then the millennium take place, "five hundred years are to be reckoned from the birth of Christ, to make up the six thousand years, and then shall be the end."[7] The excellent Cyprian (about the middle of the same century) frequently asserts that the end of the world was then just at hand; that "the world was in its decay," and "its end drawing very nigh;"[8] that it was "already in a state of decay, and encompassed with a host of besetting evils;"[9] that "not to mention the predictions of Scripture, the world itself bore witness, by the declining state of every thing in it, to its speedy dissolution."[1] The same warning is repeated by Ambrose, near the end of the fourth century. "Although," he says, "in the beginning we determined to know nothing but Jesus Christ, and him crucified, yet now, being close upon the judgment, we no longer make Christ crucified the subject of our thoughts,

[7] Hippol. Comm. in Daniel., in "Daniel sec. Sept." Romæ, 1772, fol. pp. 99—101.

[8] Cypr. De Unit. Eccles. § 14.

[9] Id. De Mortal. § 19.

[1] Id. Tract. ad Demetr. § 2.

but are looking for him coming in the clouds."[2] Two centuries later, the Church had the same testimony from Gregory the Great. After alluding to the troubles, earthquakes, and pestilences, that had taken place shortly before in divers places, he observes that " since those predicted signs had appeared, there was *no doubt* that the few which remained would immediately follow; which things we say, dear brethren, that your minds may be stirred up to watchfulness and caution," &c. " The world is now oppressed by its very old age, and carried with increasing rapidity, by growing infirmities, to that death which is close upon it. Love not, then, my brethren, that which you see cannot last long."[3]

The next instance I will mention is that of Johannes de Rupescissa, who, in the year 1349, declared that dreadful wars, earthquakes, and judgments of various kinds, were about to come upon the earth, and that Christ should come in 1370, and a glorious state of the Church commence, which should last a thousand years.[4] And so certain was he of all this, that he declared that God had enabled him in a special manner to understand the prophetical writings of Scripture, and that what he stated was so clearly to be proved from them, that it was a testimony better supported than one resting upon the greatest miracles; so that those who did not believe him were left without excuse.[5]

There was also a book written in 1575, by " Scheltco a Geueren" in Latin, and published in English in this country by the learned and pious Thomas Rogers of that period;[6] published, as the translator tells us, " that by reciting the signs and tokens of dangers imminent, and of the world's destruction, he might draw the wicked from securitie, and

[2] Ambros. Comment. in Luc. c. 21, lib. 10, § 1.

[3] Gregor. M. Homil. in Evangel., hom. 1, in Luc. c. 21.

[4] Joh. de Rupescissa, " Prophetiæ," and " Vade Mecum in tribulatione," in Append. ad Fascic. Rer. expetend. pp. 494—508.

[5] Ib. p. 496.

[6] Under the title, " Of the End of this World and Second Comming of Christ, a comfortable and moste necessarie discourse for these miserable and daungerous dayes." Lond. 1577, 4to.; 1582, 8vo; 1583, 8vo.

drive them to a care of godlinesse and virtue."[7] In this book the author collects many testimonies of different kinds, particularly such as wars, earthquakes, pestilences, &c. seemed to afford him, to prove that according to Scripture the end of the world must be at hand. He says, these and other signs "are out of all doubt the evident signs of the world's speedy overthrow and hasty coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, to judge the quick and the dead."[8] "A great and infallible argument it is, and agreeing to God's word, and to the course of time, that this *certain computation of years* doth signify the Lord's coming to be very nigh at hand."[9] "And, therefore, because of these things which have been spoken, we do well enough and sufficiently know that the kingdom of God is at hand; let us lift up our heads to heaven; let us contemn all worldly things," &c.[1]

There was also an excellent little treatise published not long after this, by Radford Mavericke, entitled "St. Peter's Watchword; the end of all things is at hand;"[2] in which, although he is far from dogmatizing on the subject, confessing that all that can be said on it is but *conjecture*,[3] yet even he hesitated not to say, after quoting our Lord's warning relating to the signs that should precede his coming, and comparing with them the events of that period, —"All which do preach unto us, that the desolation of all things is at hand." "There have been many extraordinary signs . . . . to admonish us that the end of all things is at hand." "Thereupon we may conclude, as our Saviour teacheth us, by the budding of the fig-tree, that the Sun of righteousness is ready to appear in the heavens, and the everlasting summer for all the children of God is even at hand."[4]

I mention these instances rather because they are less known than others, but it would be easy to multiply the number to almost any extent. The cases of Alsted, at

[7] Ed. 1582. Ep. Ded. p. 2.
[8] Ib. leaf 46.
[9] Ib. leaf 51.
[1] Ib. leaf 71.
[2] Lond. 1603, small 8vo.
[3] Leaf 36.
[4] Leaves 25, 26, and 27.

the beginning of the seventeenth century, of Jurieu, at the latter end of it, and of Bishop Lloyd, at the beginning of the eighteenth, all excellent and learned men, are well known. The former, in his work "Of the Millennium," first published in 1627,[5] asserts confidently that the millennium would commence in 1694. Alluding to this and other similar assertions, the author of the work entitled "Nunc jus Propheticus," published here in 1642 in Latin, observes, "Indeed there are as many opinions as authors on the subject. One author assigns this year, and another that, and a third differs in his account from both. But it is agreed by all, that this thrice happy and golden age is now at hand. Alsted, the champion of the millenarians, and a main prop of this newly revived doctrine, names, and confidently determines, the year of Christ 1694 (which is fifty-two years hence) for the first year of this triumphant reign of the saints here on earth. Others judge the time uncertain, and certainly their judgment, in my opinion, is the most certain." The same mistaken confidence which Alsted displayed, is to be found in the prophetical writings of Jurieu.[6] Among other things, he says, that the fall of the antichristian empire, i. e. the Papacy, and the termination of the 1260 years, "according to all appearance, must happen between 1710 and 1715."[7] And in his preface he says, "If you read with any favourable opinion what I say upon the 11th, 14th, and 16th chapters of the Apocalypse, I cannot believe you will have much different thoughts from mine. *I will not call them conjectures; let them be such to others, I consent; but as to*

[5] J. H. Alstedii De Mille annis, 1627. 4to. In Engl. under the title, "The Beloved City, or, the Saints Reign on Earth a Thousand Years. Lond. printed in the year of the last expectation of the saints, 1643." 4to.

[6] L'Accomplissement des Propheties ou la deliverance prochaine de l'Eglise. Sec. ed. corrig. et augm. Rotterd. 1686. 2 v. 12mo. In English. Lond. 1687. 8vo. two parts. Suite de l'accomplissement des Propheties. Rotterd. 1687. 12mo. In Engl. Lond. 1688. 8vo.

[7] Engl. ed. pt. 2, p. 54.

me, there is something more, for I think I have discovered," &c. &c.[8]

So Bishop Lloyd endeavoured to prove to Queen Anne, out of Daniel and the Revelations, that four years from that time there would be a war of religion, and that the popedom would be destroyed, &c.[9] The *personal* reign of Christ upon earth, and its commencement about the year 1700, was advocated in 1642 by John Archer.[1]

I will detain the reader with only one case more of this kind, that of Mr. John Mason, Rector of Water Stratford, Buckinghamshire,[2] whose notions on the subject were derived, through a friend, from Alsted's work mentioned above, and he *confidently* asserted that the millennium would commence in 1694, adding, contrary to Alsted's opinion,[3] that it would be a personal reign of Christ here on earth.[4] He preached this for four years previous to the year 1694, and obtained many followers.[5] He also supposed that our Lord appeared to him in April of that year, as a sort of forewarning of his approach.[6] He considered himself the especial harbinger of Christ; and was accustomed to preach twice every day. He and his followers formed themselves into a distinct party, and had all things in common; waiting in daily expectation of the coming of Christ. And so firm were his convictions on the subject, that he declared most positively that he should never die.[7] His death, however, happened before the termination of the year, but it did not for some time lessen the expectation of his followers of the fulfilment of his pre-

[8] Engl. ed. pref. near the end.

[9] Chalmers's Biog. Dict. under "Lloyd (William.)"

[1] John Archer's Personal reign of Christ upon earth, &c. Lond. 1642. 4to.

[2] See H. Maurice's Impartial Account of Mr. John Mason. Lond. 1695. 4to.

[3] See "The Beloved City," &c. p. 71.

[4] Impartial Account, pp. 41—43.

[5] Ibid, p. 4. [6] Ibid. pp. 5, 6.

[7] See "Some remarkable passages in the Life and Death of Mr. John Mason," &c. Lond. 1694. 4to.

dictions of the coming of Christ. Of himself, it was stated by his sister, "for soundness of doctrine, for Christian converse, and for exemplary conversation, he has not left his fellow in the world. He had such a continual tide to spirituality, such a zeal to the glory of God, and such a flame of love to Jesus Christ, that I never saw the like," &c.[7] And it is the testimony of an *impartial* and *competent* witness—"He was a person of as great devotion as ever I met with, and his main aim was to make all he conversed with to be religious. I think, verily, he was not only temperate but mortified; not only true and just, but kind and charitable. . . . He was very affable in his carriage, meek in his converse, and never over earnest, unless, where he thought he could not exceed, for God."[8] "His parts were once above the common level."[9] And hence his sister replied to one who was endeavouring to convince her of their mistake, "O Sir, the holiness of his life makes it impossible that God should permit him to be deceived."[1]

[7] Impartial account, p. 22. [8] Ibid. p. 28. [9] Ibid. p. 29.

[1] Ibid. p. 12. Of the apparent character of Mr. Mason's piety, the reader shall judge for himself from the following letter, printed, among others, in an account of him published soon after his death, and which I insert here for its intrinsic excellence. After some general observations, he adds:—

"My friends, consider how great things the Lord has done for you. Call to mind your former experiences, and live as those whom the Lord has redeemed by his blood. Now you must look upon yourselves as the Lord Christ's, and not your own. Consider from what you are called, and to what you are called. Would you live *holily*, observe these rules. Live in the eye of God; observe the example of Christ; consider the fruit and end of things; the fruit of sin is shame and sorrow; sin is a viper in the end; but the fruit of righteousness is peace, holiness is eternal life in the end. 4. Bind the commandments upon your hearts. 5. Shun the appearances of the least beginnings of sin. 6. Be fervent and frequent in secret prayer. My friends, would you live *comfortably*, take these directions: 1. Live not so much upon the comforts of God as upon the God of comforts. Be afraid of unbelief; that is a great sin. Do not greaten your sins above God's saving power. Labour, and believe upon the word firmly and constantly. Trust perfectly to the grace and mercy of God in Christ. *I will trust in the mercy of God* (saith David) *for ever and ever.* Ps. lii. 2. Beware of sin, especially of wilful sin; for that will bring a cloud, and make a breach between God and the soul. 3. Do *not mind earthly things.* O take heed of *unlawful*

Who, then, I would ask, with these cases before him, and a just conception of the inadequacy of his finite powers

affections, of an unlawful carriage of the heart about *lawful things.* 4. Examine the ways of your heart daily; search yourselves; *What sin have I committed? What duty have I omitted this day?* Every night look back upon the thoughts and affections and speeches of the day past. Confess your failings over the head of the scape-goat. This is another necessary means to keep your peace with God, and to walk comfortably before him, and I pray observe it. 5. Examine your heart further, and consider the gracious actings and workings of God's blessed Spirit within you, what good thoughts, what good desires, aims, resolutions, has God put into you. Consider what outgoings of your heart after God there have been, what incomes and influence of his grace. Daily examine your hearts for these things, and give God the glory of all the gracious workings of his Spirit in your souls. 6. If you would walk comfortably with God, mind not what is forged, but what is written; heed not every fancy that the devil darts into you; for then you lie at the mercy of your enemy; but keep close to the written word of God. *Thus it is written,* said our Saviour to Satan the tempter. So much for comfortable walking. Dear friends, would you walk *peaceably* and *charitably,* take these rules: 1. God has called you to peace. 2. When Christ was reviled, *he reviled not again.* 3. If others neglect their duties to you, yet do not you neglect your duties to God nor to them. Let not another's sin cause you to sin. To render railing for railing, is to return sin for sin. 4. You must show your love to God whom you have not seen, by your love to your brother whom you see daily; show your piety by your charity. 5. An unbridled tongue is a sign of an unsanctified heart. They that have not a dram of grace to tame their tongues, shall one day want a drop of water to cool their tongues. 6. Do good to others; if they do not thank you for it, yet God will bless you for it. The less reward you have on earth the greater shall your reward be in heaven. As the less wages the servant takes up within his year, the more comes in at the year's end. Dear friends, would you be *constant in good ways and purposes,* take these directions. 1. You have engaged yourselves to God, and therefore you must keep yourselves from idols; you have given up *your names to God,* and you must give up *your hearts to God;* you have made a covenant with God by sacraments; if Satan or the world are suitors for your hearts, tell them *you are already disposed of, you are pre-engaged to God, you have chose your God, and you must not think of changing your God.* 2. Whither will ye go from Christ? Where do you think to find *such another God as your God? such another friend as Jesus Christ?* 3. It is good to draw near to God, and yet better to draw nearer to God: still the nearer the better: one may see an end of earthly perfection, but there is no end of the perfection of Jesus Christ. 4. Be downright for God, and you shall find soul-heartening comfort in God that shall keep you close to God. 5. Walk humbly with your God, that is

to unfold the secret counsels of God, and open to the view that over which God has evidently thrown the veil of mystery, by clothing it in figurative language, will venture to dogmatize on this subject? But, alas! there are those who will talk as familiarly and confidently of approaching judgments, and the coming of Christ being at hand, as if the book of prophecy was to them as clear as a history of past events. They are somewhat like the philosopher of Cairo, in Johnson's beautiful allegory, and talk as confidently of the times and seasons, as if they were in their own power, and certainly not as if they were "known only to the Father." And they who do not urge *these* views of prophecy upon their hearers, are supposed to neglect one of the most important parts of their message. To such I would earnestly commend the above facts for their attentive and *prayerful* consideration. The examples quoted above are *most* of them not those of *ordinary* men; and therefore deserve more than ordinary regard. And the simple questions I would suggest to those who are now pursuing the same course with them, are, Am I not advancing the same views which they did, and were found to be in error? Am I more likely to be right than they were? Is this the mode of teaching and building up the Church of Christ, which experience has shown to be the

the way to walk closely with your God. If a Christian be humble, he is a Christian indeed; God will not suffer such a one to be tempted beyond his strength. 6. Let not opinions swim in your head; that will make you fall: let the great things of religion sink into your heart, and that will make you stand. 7. Be content, yea, willing to suffer for Christ, who did so contentedly and willingly suffer for you; and if you suffer with Him, you shall be glorified together. Now, my dear friends, the Lord be with you all. I beseech Him to strengthen, stablish, confirm, and settle you, and to preserve you all to his holy and everlasting kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord, in whom I am,

Your faithful Friend."

Some remarkable passages in the Life and death of Mr. John Mason Drawn up by a Reverend Divine, &c. London. 1694. 4to. pp. 11—13.

most effectual? Was not "Christ crucified," the *great* subject of the apostle's preaching? and is not the great object of the Holy Spirit's teaching to "convince men of sin, righteousness, and judgment?"

I reserve, however, a few concluding remarks on the whole subject for the next chapter.

CHAPTER V.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE WHOLE SUBJECT.

It has thus been shown, *first,* (in Chap. II.) that the very characteristics which distinguish the supposed gifts of these claimants, are not, according to the testimony of Scripture, and of the whole Christian Church in all ages, such as can be reconciled with the supposition of their being divinely inspired; and, *secondly,* (in Chap. III. and IV.) that they are just *the* characteristics which have distinguished false prophets in all ages, and have been accompanied in them with far greater signs and wonders than any which the present claimants have exhibited. We meet them here, therefore, *upon their own ground,* (and to do so I have hitherto omitted all notice of those fundamental doctrinal errors, those failures of their prophecies, those internal dissensions and self-contradictions that are open to the view of the most casual observer;) and we find that the very characteristics they boast of as distinguishing their supposed gifts are *of themselves* fatal to their pretensions.

I would now, in conclusion, beg the reader's attention to a few general observations on the attendant circumstances of these manifestations, and on some arguments generally urged in their favour, with a caution on the indulgence of those expectations, through the encouragement of which so many have in all ages been deluded.

The similarity that exists between the characteristics of

all the unauthorized claimants of the prophetic office that have hitherto appeared, is not a little remarkable. It arises, no doubt, from their all having in view the same example, viz. that of the prophets of Scripture, with the necessary conviction that, if they were obliged to confess themselves to be differently affected by the prophetic influence, they would have no ground to stand upon. Hence their assumption and imitation of various gifts that have usually been annexed to that office.

But it is certainly difficult to account for the frequent reappearance of *those* phenomena, that have no *plausible* grounds adducible for them from Scripture, and have been frequently condemned by the whole Church; such, for instance, more particularly as preaching to people in sounds they do not understand, and asserting that the prophetic influence alienates, for a time, the reasoning faculties of the prophet. Were it not for the fact that people are misled by such pretensions, one might suppose it to be too absurd, and, at the present day, too stale an artifice to proceed from the crafty ingenuity of Satan. Nor, as it appears to the writer, is it at all improbable that such manifestations are often the mere ebullitions of natural enthusiasm, or even the effect of strong excitement. This clearly appears to have been the case with the author of the first account from which we quoted in Chapter I., and also with the Mr. Nicholson, whose case has been mentioned in that of the French and English prophets, in Chapter IV., both of whom were, as long as they agreed with them, recognized as brethren by the prophets of their respective party. It is quite clear, from their own testimony, that their feelings were roused so as, for a time, to overpower their judgment. Their reasoning faculties were not strong enough to control the impulses of their feelings. That such cases are by no means uncommon, every man's experience will testify. By whatever objects the affections are strongly moved, if there be not an *overbalancing* power in the reason and judgment, the man is like a vessel, without rudder or ballast, encountering a gale.

The well-known remark of Horace, that if a man would make another weep he must first weep himself, has been often and justly applied to preachers. No man can expect to move his auditory, who shows no sign of being affected himself. But if it be true, that the emotions manifested in the preacher have a powerful effect upon his hearers, then it follows, that one who has much natural enthusiasm, and throws it without reserve into the delivery of his discourse, has all that part of his auditors, whose feelings are more powerful than their judgments, completely at his command. Their feelings of anger, of sorrow, of joy, follow, and are *commensurate with* his. In this state, no man will deny that they are ready to imbibe his spirit and his doctrines, upon the *slightest possible* foundation. And when once the balance of the mind has thus been overturned, experience proves that there is no point of extravagance to which the excited feelings will not carry such a person. Now be it so, that when the spirit and doctrines of a man are agreeable to the word of God, such an excitement may, under the Divine blessing, be productive of a good result. It will not, however, be denied, that oftentimes, even under such circumstances, the excitement has very little of genuine religious feeling in it; as for instance, when Massillon pronounced the celebrated passage respecting the day of judgment, and his auditors rose up horror-struck, many shrieking with terror. Similar effects are by no means uncommon. The Methodists boast (I use the word in no invidious sense) of them, without pretending to assert that they are all of the right kind. And nothing, perhaps, can better show how easily such effects may be produced in some persons, than what the antients say of the effects produced by the weeping of the *hired* mourners that attended funerals among the Romans and others, by whose imitation of the signs of real grief, many who saw them used to be so affected that, though perfectly *conscious* of their being hired for the occasion, they could not forbear to weep like them. Let the impartial reader, then, *first* consider whether this is not *abstractedly* true, and *then* apply it, to see

how far it will account for *much* that has happened in the case under consideration. What, let him consider, is the natural result to be anticipated from constant attendance on the preaching of a powerful and eloquent orator, whose great aim and talent is to excite the feelings of his auditors, and who is continually impressing upon them the statement that the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit are to be desired, to be prayed for, and to be earnestly expected? What, more especially, I would ask, is the probable consequence when that same orator argues, with all the warmth of his natural enthusiasm, in favour of the incoherent and unintelligible effusions of certain individuals, uttered confessedly in a state of alienation of mind? Is it to be supposed for a moment that such addresses would have none, or a small, effect upon an auditory whom his powers of imagination and eloquence had made to hang upon his lips? Is it to be conceived that there would be none present, whose feelings, too powerful for their control, would be glad to find vent in that allowed and ennobled, but easy, utterance of unintelligible sounds, which, when poured forth in such a state, they had been taught to believe was a sign of the Holy Spirit speaking by them; or even to utter excellent exhortations, such as the discourses they had been in the habit of hearing, or a religious education, would enable them, in that excited state, to do without difficulty? Such an effect, *under such circumstances*, might naturally be expected, even in those who, without these exciting causes, would never have been betrayed into such excess. And let it be remembered, that when once a person has yielded to the influence of "the power," the only difficulty afterwards is to restrain it, as the instances already mentioned fully prove.

That many such prophets, then, should rise up under the preaching of Mr. Irving, no one at all acquainted with human nature, or the history of such phenomena, will think surprising.

But, in fact, there is every reason to believe, from the testimony of those who have studied the phenomena of such

cases, that there are many who need no foreign excitement to produce such manifestations. Without entering into any scientific discussion of this matter, which on the present occasion I would wish to avoid, as less likely to be interesting or useful to those for whose use this work is principally intended, I would remind my readers how many there are whose whole conduct seems to be guided by the impulses of the feelings and the fancies of the imagination, instead of the dictates of sound reason and judgment; I mean, even among those who are (in the common acceptation of the terms) honest, sincere, and religious persons, and whose imagination is not really diseased. When, therefore, such persons become deeply affected with the spiritual truths of the word, and are carried beyond the bounds of visible objects by faith in its wonderful revelations, there is danger that instead of making it the great object of their lives to understand, exemplify, and inculcate, the saving and practical parts of that word, they may be led to give a disproportionate share of attention to those parts which, from being mysterious, or prophetic, or treating of what is out of the usual course of God's providence, suit their disposition, and give room for their fancy to luxuriate; and in the intent meditation upon which, their excited feelings and over-wrought imagination may altogether overwhelm the voice of reason and judgment.

And here let it be observed, that we are not, as is common in the supporters of such cases as that we are considering, to argue thus: These persons are evidently pious, and consequently taught of God, and therefore they are right. For even granting that their general conduct is a proof of real piety, and some degree of divine teaching, it does not follow that they have been taught of God in the particular point in question, any more than it follows that the sins into which any of God's servants may at times be betrayed, are agreeable to the will of God, because committed by his servants. Every point that respects doctrine or conduct is to be tried, not by the apparent character of its author, but by the word of God.

The peculiar effect of this natural enthusiasm, (if we may so call it,) when excited, is, to confound and overwhelm the reasoning faculties and the judgment, so as to produce to a greater or less extent, according to the violence of the impulse, a temporary alienation or suspension of those powers, and leave the person under the guidance of a heated imagination and excited feelings. We have an illustration of such a case in one who has allowed himself to be *overcome* by the feeling of anger. In a person of strong and uncontrolled feelings, when the imagination is impressed with the idea of injury inflicted, and the excited feeling of anger has been allowed to work in the mind, the reason and judgment will be found sometimes to have lost their sway to that extent that the man will pour out his words with so little consciousness of what he is saying, that when the fit is over, he would be utterly unable to repeat his own words, and even surprised to hear what he had uttered. Now such is exactly the condition of one of these modern prophets under the influence of "the power." Instances of the former kind are, it is to be hoped, rare, and the indulgence of the excitement in such a case is so manifestly opposed to the interests of man, as well as to the law of God, that it is seldom allowed to proceed so far. But in the latter case, the objects producing the excitement being of the best kind, the affections are often allowed, in the contemplation of them, to be carried, unaccompanied by the judgment, to that excess of effervescence that places them beyond command. And why this should not be followed by the same effects as those which are produced by any other objects that place a man under the control of his unsubdued feelings, or of any one particular passion, as love or anger, except through the *particular* favour and mercy of God, no good reason can be given.

Wherever the feelings are naturally strong, the imagination hot and impressible, and the reason and judgment weak or *inactive*, there these effects may be expected, varying only in character with the objects by which the imagination and the feelings are most impressed; and

hence it is that in all such cases women have borne so conspicuous a part. That the imagination, if suffered to bear sway over the mind, may obtain an overpowering influence over the whole frame, is a fact which stands upon proofs and examples innumerable. Thus it is argued by Casaubon, that it is quite possible, without the concurrence of any supernatural cause, for a man or woman of a suitable temperament, to put themselves into a trance or ecstasy when they will, which he supports by various arguments and examples, observing, among other remarks;—"that a man may by intent imagination or cogitation bring himself to a vertigo, as will make him fall to the ground, and trouble his brain very much, best physicians do affirm, nay, that . . . intent imagination is enough to beget διαθεσιν, epilepticam, [epilepsy,] is observed by Guil. Fabricius, Cent. 3, Observ. 3, to whom Sennertus doth consent. Have there not been men or women, boys or girls, and children, in the world, who at the very remembrance of some very sad or terrible thing that had happened unto them in their life, would fall into a swoon whether they would or no? How much more if they affected it, and after some two or three unvoluntary fits, finding some disposition in themselves to it, and aiming at some advantage by it, or proposing to themselves some other end, used means, by intent cogitation or otherwise, to bring themselves into a habit of it? Is there any thing in this impossible? If I should rub up mine own memory, I could tell of many things that I have known in my time in that kind. But why should not I, in things so ordinary, leave all men to their own experience?"——"I think I have said enough to conclude, that, granting what must be granted, and doth often happen in the world, besides the ordinary course of nature, yet by causes that are natural, as such and such an *idiosyncrisia*, and the like, a voluntary ecstasy is not a thing impossible to nature. I have since lighted upon the same question, handled by a very learned man, a profound philosopher, in my judgment . . . Anton. P. Sancta Cruz. . . . . He doth clearly deliver himself as I do here, that such voluntary ecstasies are possible in

nature. I will put some of his words here. *Maxime difficile*, saith he, *et arduum opus est, tales mutationes cognoscere, an sint a Deo, an a propria voluntate, an a dæmone.* That is, *It is very hard and difficult to determine of such changes, or passions of the soul, whether they be from God or from one's proper will and endeavour, or, lastly, from the devil.* And then again; *Atque quamvis dispositio ille* [*illa*] *soleat fieri, &c. a malo dæmone aut a proprio appetitu vehementer moto ad aliquam novitatis finem, quod ut est difficile cognoscere, ita maxime dolendum.* That is, *And although this state*, or *disposition, of the soul may happen . . . as by the power of the devil . . . so by a strong desire of the party for some ambitious end: which, as it is not easy to discern, so the more to be lamented.*"[1] And this it must be recollected, as Casaubon observes, was spoken by one who was writing among those by whom such supposed raptures were in great esteem.

Nor is it to be forgotten, that religious and prophetic raptures may be traced to, and are confessedly often the offspring of, that state of the imagination, in which, though not actually diseased, it either is united with a state of bodily temperament, whose hot and active vapours discolour its conceptions upon the subject it is contemplating, which are thus received by the mind through a jaundiced medium, and even produce false impressions upon it; or has been weakened by frequent excitement in the habitual indulgence of contemplative and devotional fervors, while the powers of reason and judgment have been comparatively inactive: and this state is almost always found connected with very susceptible and excitable feelings. The truth of this is proved by the recorded experience of all ages; and the remarks of a learned author, written long before even the time of the French and English prophets, are so much to the point, and illustrative of our present subject, that I cannot forbear offering the reader the following extract.

[1] Mer. Casaubon's Treat. concerning Enthusiasm. 2nd Ed. London, 1656. 8vo. pp. 127—30.

Mr. Spencer, in his "Treatise on the Vanity of Vulgar Prophecies," written in 1665, speaking of such persons, observes, that in such cases "men of a more contemplative genius conceit themselves inspired with some rare mysteries in nature, with the cabbalistic sense of Scripture, with the understanding of the hidden analogies between the sensible and intelligible, and the greater and lesser world. . . . . And persons of a more devotional complexion talk much of visions, raptures, converse with angels, and prophecy . . . How the humours of the body arrive at an ability thus to impregnate the mind . . . is an inquiry not pertinent here; but to question that so they can, is to speak ourselves strangers to all the stories of hypochondriacs, books and discourses abound withal; and that 'tis nothing but the enormous power of a disturbed imagination that bears down these persons into a belief of divine visions, voices, and illapses, appears sufficiently in that they usually commence prophets *per saltum*, and before they are tolerably qualified with knowledge or piety, they become inspired; and that, though heaven and earth refute their predictions once and again, a heart deceived by the fulness and importunity of the impression hath so turned them aside, that they cannot attend," &c. Such persons, he observes, often fancy themselves to see visions, which they immediately conclude to be divine discoveries to them. "This," he says, "the philosopher hath noted, *men that are of a talkative and melancholy temper see any kind of visions.*"[2] They have also, "vehement incitations to prophecy." "They feel the new images of things or persons striking with great strength and evidence upon their fancies, and themselves quickened by a very hot and active principle, whose powers they cannot easily stand against, *to make the vision plain*, and to declare to others what conceits and passions it comes attended with; and therefore they conceive that *the word of the Lord is as a fire shut up in their bones*, and that they

[2] Ὅσων αν ἡ φυσις λαλος εστι και μελαγχολικη παντοδαπας οψεις ὁρωσι. Arist. De Divin. per Insomn. c. 1.

are εν πνευματι, [*in the Spirit*,] wholly possest by some divine power which they cannot bear themselves against, nay, indeed, *should not*, for who are they that should *withstand God?* Whereas all these things are but the subtil fallacies which the fumes of hypochondriacal melancholy, when grown hot and fiery, put upon the fancy, being as apt to intoxicate the brain, and make it impressive to as odd conceits as the active vapours of lusty wine. These vapours being carried by the brain with a mighty force, confound the natural figurations thereof, and excite some new idols therein, which, by the singularity of their appearance, and importunity of occurrence, cannot but create affections correspondent to them, (Job xxxii. 18—20,) which, together with those fiery spirits, will put men upon great freedom of speech, (that which a very affecting dream will sometimes do,) to deliver themselves of those strange thoughts which, upon such occasions, will rise up within them. Now, 'tis no wonder at all, as the philosopher[3] saith, if such kind of men, being thus *incited to speak very much and of very various things*, (the scenes of fancy being so often shifted by these giddy vapours,) *that they have some fortunate hits* and true divinations. That 'tis only the foreign heat of these vapours which excites these predictions, appears probable in that every[4] flatuous calefaction of the brain whence soever it arise, is apt to make a man ecstatical, to express itself in wonderful speeches, and those often prophetical. The vapours of wine meeting with some constitutions, have strangely aped an enthusiasm."—" As for that mighty ardour whereby they are carried forth to deliver themselves, it is perfectly a natural thing, being but the impatience of that hot and nimble vapour of fermented melancholy."—" I intend not to deny but that the devil, (who works by darkness as God by light,) may sometimes inter-

[3] Δια το πολλα και παντοδαπα κινεισθαι επιτυγχανουσιν ὁμοιοις θεωρημασιν επιτυχεις οντες. Aristot. De Divin. per Insomn. c. 2.

[4] Cerebri flatuosa calefactio, undecunque proveniat, sub certa temperie constituta, incitat ad mira eloquenda, per cantilenas, hominemque supra se pene constituit. Christ. a Castro. De Vaticin. l. 1. c. 21.

pose; and where he finds the mind fitted by this distemper for him to work upon, may, (to make the imposture more fine and subtil,) act it to some expressions beyond the bare capacities of this juggling humour, as to speak languages, to tell some things at distance . . . . which the German prophetess, Christina, often did."[5]—And so he intimates in another part, that such effects may often be greatly promoted, if not produced, by the habits of men. "No men," he says, "are more subject to such delusions than men of devout affections, if of strong fancies, impressive tempers, and weak intellectuals; for in such persons an indiscreet use of religion, by very pensive and solemn thoughts, affected retirements and silences, too intense meditations, continual fervours and endeavoured heats, unreasonable fastings and watchings, the neglect of innocent diversions and relaxations, especially if joined with the continual study of some dark prophecies and visions in Scripture, (more proper entertainments of men of great learning,) cannot easily fail of intoxicating the mind with wild and extravagant imaginations. The overstraining of them by such intense devotions and perpetual fervours hath produced so many cracked brains, pretended prophets and visionists, in the Religious Houses of the Romish Church."[6]

Now it will, no doubt, be said by the supporters of our modern claimants, according to their usual mode of reasoning, that these characteristics do by no means belong to their prophets, for that they are persons of education, of intelligence, of sober piety, of good judgment, &c. &c. But who is to be the judge of this, and what are the legitimate proofs of it? If conduct is the only certain test of character, such an *assertion* is utterly valueless. It can convince no one who calls in question their conduct. Nor is it a question relating to their *general* conduct, though it must certainly affect it, but of their conduct in *this particular instance*, whether *it* is the fruit of a sober piety

[5] See pp. 97—108.

[6] See p. 70.

and a sound judgment. If not, their character, *as far as this point is concerned*, must be estimated accordingly.

Much has been said of the supernatural power of the voice, and *mode of utterance*, of the speaker in these manifestations. But as Mr. Irving himself finds a resemblance to them "in the sublimest and most impassioned moods of Mrs. Siddons and Miss O'Neil,"[7] there can be little difficulty, I think, on that head. For what is the excitement of an actress, when imitating the actions of another, for the amusement of the public, when compared with that of a person worked up by intense desire and prayer for extraordinary utterance, and then speaking, as he supposes, as the organ of the Spirit? In fact, such *extraordinary excitement* is itself a ground of suspicion, both intrinsically, and because it has no foundation to rest upon in Scripture. Any argument, indeed, drawn from *the mode of utterance*, must be given up now by the party itself, because one of themselves, "whose utterances were boasted of as in the highest degree powerful and searching," "has since confessed that she was acting a part, and that the utterances in question were the result of previous secret preparation."[8]

The great, and, in fact, with the exception of the "constrained utterance," the only, sign by which our modern claimants have endeavoured to confirm their alleged gift of prophecy, is what they call the gift of tongues, *i. e.* the utterance of certain unintelligible sounds, which, it appears from a remark of the Editor of "The General Delusion," they now despair of being able to identify with any mundane language. Of this sign he speaks, as we may recollect, thus: "When the Church has got into this state, the last expedient of God's ingenious benevolence is put forth, in speaking himself in a tongue *unknown to men*, as a sign of some other than the man's own spirit inhabiting the speaker . . . and the only safety of men is declared to consist in fleeing out of the Babel of human systems, and in confiding

[7] Fraser's Mag. for March, 1832.

[8] M'Neile's Letters to a Friend. Lond. 1834, 12mo. pp. 180, 181.

on the Holy Ghost alone, giving up ourselves in all simplicity of trust to his guidance."[9]

Truly this "last expedient" is very different from any that have preceded it; and, moreover, very difficult to reconcile with that character of God, which all his preceding "expedients" have displayed, that he should speak to men so that they cannot possibly understand him. And as this author himself tells us, in another place, that "Satan can inspire men to speak either known or unknown languages, to preach the gospel, to warn men against himself," &c.[1] he ought to be prepared with some very good reason, better than his own convictions afford us, that this "last expedient," so unlike and irreconcilable with all former "expedients," does not proceed from that source. It is useless to reply, that Satan would not have attempted anything new, but only imitated the works of God, as our author reasons in another place,[2] because this can stand only upon the idea that otherwise he "would be easily discovered," or that men could only be induced to put confidence in that which was like the past operations of God. But that this is not the case, our author himself is a proof, for he hails the *new* sign, as "the last expedient of God's ingenious benevolence," and, therefore, the *novelty* of a sign would be no proof to him that it proceeded from Satan. As far as he is open to such deception, he is as likely to be deceived by a new sign as by the imitation of an old one.

With respect to confirmatory signs, then, our modern claimants are most singularly deficient; for although Mohammed was too wise to affect them,[3] and others may be found like him in this respect, most similar claims have been attended, as we have already seen, with pretensions to the manifestation of various signs and wonders, both *in* and *by* their authors. In this case, however, there is not *one* proof of this kind, for, as yet, it rests upon the mere assertion of the parties interested, that "the tongue" is any thing more than a collection of unmeaning sounds,

[9] Pref. pp. xxviii, xxix.
[2] Note, p. 284.
[1] Pref. p. xxiii.
[3] See Prideaux's Life, &c.

poured forth under the influence of strong excitement, and that the constrained utterance is any thing more than the natural effect of that excitement. Granting this point, however, the case has so partial a similarity to that of the apostles, and the promises connected with such cases, that even on this ground there is no little difficulty; for the promise was, "they shall speak with new tongues, shall take up serpents, shall cast out devils," &c. &c. (Mark xvi. 17); and accordingly, we find, that, among the apostles and primitive Christians, though one individual might not possess all these gifts, yet that all these gifts were in the Church, and betokened the presence of the promised Spirit in his extraordinary gifts. It is true, indeed, as we learn from Mr. Baxter, that such gifts are expected by them, and to an extent (like the Montanists of old) beyond even that vouchsafed to the apostles. But till such is the case, bare assertions and violent raptures will avail them little with any whose feelings are under the control of their reason and judgment.

But suppose that their claim to be prophets were supported by real signs and miracles, that their "tongue" were a tongue, and the power by which they speak supernatural, and that some considerable cures had been wrought by them, let us consider how far this would confirm that claim. In the first place, then, let us observe, that we have the testimony of one of their principal supporters that such things may be done by the power of Satan. And this admission is abundantly confirmed by Scripture. Thus we find many of the miracles of Moses imitated by the Egyptian magicians. (See Exod. vii. 11, 22, and viii. 7.) Again, the admonition of God to the Jews of old, was, "If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, *and the sign or the wonder come to pass*, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God proveth you to know whether ye love

the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul." (Deut. xiii. 1—3.) And this is exactly parallel to the case of signs or wonders wrought under the present dispensation for the purpose of confirming doctrines contrary to those of our Lord and his apostles. So our Lord tells us, that many will say to him in the day of judgment,—" Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name have cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works; to whom he will say, I never knew you;" (Matt. vii. 22, 23;) and forewarned the Church that there should arise false Christs and false prophets, who should show great signs and wonders, insomuch that if it were possible they should deceive the very elect. (Matt. xxiv. 24; Mark xiii. 22.) So St. Paul forewarned the Church of " him whose coming is after the working of Satan, *with all power and signs and lying wonders.*" (2 Thess. ii. 9.) And St. John, in the same spirit of prophecy, foretold that the second beast, whose rise was revealed to him, " doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do." (Rev. xiii. 13, 14.)

Hence miracles are in themselves quite insufficient to prove the divine mission of a pretended prophet; and so good authors of all parties have unanimously determined. " Miracles and wonders," says Del Rio, " are not sufficient proof of a revelation, because the devil can do such things."[4] And Peter du Moulin, in his " Prophet," after referring to Deut. xiii. 1—3, and 1 John iv. 1, 2, says,— " For God would have us judge of miracles and prophecies from the doctrine connected with them, and not, as is generally done, of the doctrine from the miracles and prophecies."[5] And to this, it is evident, the Editor of " The

[4] Mira et prodigia non satis idoneè revelationem confirmant, quià potest ea dæmon efficere. Del Rio, Diss. Mag. p. 235.

[5] Nempe Deus vult judicari de miraculis et prophetiis ex doctrina, non vero, ut fieri assolet, de doctrina ex miraculis et prophetiis. P. Molin. Vates, lib. 3. c. 5. Ed. 1640. p. 147.

General Delusion of Christians" is prepared *theoretically* to assent.

There are, however, it is to be feared, many who may even unconsciously illustrate the truth of Du Moulin's remark, and allow an apparent miracle to take some hold of their minds *before* they have diligently examined the doctrine promulgated in connexion with it It is no wonder, therefore, if they are deceived.

They who possess what they know to be the word of God have therein an infallible test of doctrine by which to try all pretensions. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Is. viii. 20.) This test is a better evidence, St. Peter tells us, than even "a voice from heaven." (2 Pet. i. 17—19.) With respect to miracles and wonders, we may be, and are very liable to be, deceived. We have *generally* no certain test *in the work itself*, by which we can pronounce upon it whether it is a divine or a satanic wonder. With respect to doctrine, we have an infallible test by which to try it; and though even here we may deceive ourselves in the application of the test, it is not the less our interest, and our duty, to avail ourselves of it with humble prayer to God for his teaching, *before* we attempt to form any judgment of that for which we have no such test. It is thus alone that we can "try the spirits," (1 John iv. 1,) and "prove all things." (1 Thess. v. 21.)

Nothing can more strongly prove the truth of this than the way in which our Lord sets before the Jews the evidences of his own divine mission. Great beyond comparison as were the miracles which he wrought, he always places their testimony to his character below that of the written word. "If I bear witness of myself," said he to the Jews, "my witness is not true, [*i. e.* this is not sufficient witness to any one,] there is another that beareth witness of me . . . . John . . . . [*i. e.* he had the testimony of one whom they acknowledged to be a prophet.] But I have *greater* witness than that of John, for *the works* which the

Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me. AND [more than that] *the Father himself* which hath sent me hath borne witness of me . . . and ye have not HIS WORD abiding in you, for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not. SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, AND THEY ARE THEY WHICH TESTIFY OF ME." (John v. 31—39.) Again, in the same chapter, (ver. 45—47,) he tells them that the writings of Moses would be the chief accusers of those who did not believe in him; and that if they did not believe the writings of Moses, which they acknowledged to be the word of God, he could not expect them to believe his words, though they were accompanied with so many miracles. And again, even more expressly, when speaking in the person of Abraham to the rich man in torments, he says, " If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one *rose from the dead*," (Luke xvi. 31,) which plainly shows that he considered the evidence of the written word recorded by Moses and the prophets superior to that afforded by the greatest miracle that can be wrought. In the same way do the apostles continually refer to the Old Testament Scriptures to prove what they taught, and not to the miracles by which their doctrines were accompanied, either in themselves or in our Lord himself. (See Acts xxvi. 22, 23, and Eph. ii. 20.) It is true, the *nature* of the evidence supplied by that word to our Lord's mission was different to that which it can afford to any who are not specifically prophesied of in it, but the *force* of its evidence, as far as it goes, is, in both cases, equally supreme.

Were, then, the signs and miracles wrought by our modern claimants, or exhibited in their persons, to be as great as those that attended our Lord himself, the testimony which the written word bears to those claimants, as to the truth or falsehood of their doctrines, must be considered *first and independently*, and reckoned *superior* to all of them. And hence, as the apostle says, " if an angel from heaven come [in the full plenitude of his supernatural powers] and

preach any other gospel unto you, than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. i. 8.) In fact, if the doctrines advanced be not in accordance with the written word, not only are miracles unable to confirm them from being insufficient *in themselves* for the purpose, but from their having an overwhelming mass of *similar* evidence to contend against in the confessedly divine miracles by which that word was originally confirmed.

Upon the whole, then, we may conclude that the testimony of miracles, when connected with any unscriptural doctrines or pretensions in those who exhibit them, is entirely without value; but that when their testimony is not thus opposed, and they are *clearly supernatural and apparently divine*, (neither of which characteristics, by the way, belong to any yet exhibited by our modern claimants,) they then form a *secondary* test of the divine mission of their authors.

Now there are few, perhaps, who will theoretically deny the truth of these remarks, but how far our modern claimants generally act upon these principles, may be judged by various facts mentioned in Mr. Baxter's Narrative,[6] and especially by Mr. Irving's reply to Mr. Baxter, inserted in the Narrative, from which it appears that upon the receipt of a letter from Mr. B., condemning his views on the human nature of our Lord and perfect holiness in the believer, Mr. Irving contents himself with laying the matter before "two prophetesses of the Lord," "who have been," he says, "His mouth of wisdom and of warning to me and my church in all perplexities," and beseeching "the Lord that he would speak his own mind in the matter;" and when one of them declared by "the Spirit that he had maintained the truth, and must not draw back from maintaining it," this miraculous exhibition of "the power" quite re-assures him; he thanks God for the revelation, and concludes that his friend has been taken in a snare.[7]

His belief of the gift therefore is made to assure him of the truth of the doctrine. At other times, however, when pressed upon the point of the insufficiency of signs and

[6] See Narrative, and pp. 21—44 above. [7] See Narrative, pp. 103, 4.

wonders as independent proofs of a divine mission, he flies at once to the correctness of their doctrines and the holiness of their lives.[8] Thus—setting out with two suppositions, both of them diametrically opposed to the sentiments of the whole Christian Church; the first respecting the person of Christ, and the second, that the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit are to be expected by the Church (and in fact, by every believer,) in all ages,—when a sign, as he thinks, appears, if the doctrine is questioned he points to the sign, and if the sign is questioned he points to the doctrine; for as to the holiness of their lives, he cannot suppose that the false prophets, who are almost to deceive the very elect, will not appear to have this evidence.

It is generally a favourite argument in defence of such claimants, that they and their supporters are persons of sincerity and piety, and people hence infer that it is next to impossible that they can be deceived. Many seem to reason in this way: These persons are certainly sincere and pious, and therefore have made this a matter of earnest prayer with God that they may not be deceived. Now we cannot suppose that God would allow such persons to be deceived, and therefore they must be right. Setting aside, however, the historical facts already mentioned that militate against this conclusion, the grounds upon which it is thus made to rest, are *in all cases* insufficient to support it. There are many cases of the kind in which the major, or first, proposition upon which it rests, is, to say the least, open to sufficient *doubt* to render it unfit to sustain the conclusion. When called upon to decide in a matter that deeply affects our most important, even our eternal, interests, *upon the evidences of sincerity and piety* offered us in any particular person or persons, those evidences should be clear as the light, and certain as divine truth, and therefore clearer and more certain far than any man can offer us, but that God-man who manifested himself to be essentially holy, harmless, and undefiled. To have in our

[8] Fraser's Magazine for March, 1832.

own bosoms a practical conviction, almost amounting to assurance, that any particular individual is a child of God, is in some *few* cases very possible, but to take that conviction even in *such* cases as the ground of action in a matter relating to religion, is what no man of common judgment would do in a matter relating to worldly concerns. But further, how many are there, whose evidences so nearly terminate with those which, as the excellent Brainerd observes, are just the characteristics of the religion of mere natural enthusiasm, as to leave it very doubtful whether any thing can be advanced to supply the deficiency of those evidences in proving the genuine piety of those in whom they appear. Take away "the zeal, concern, and fervency in the things of religion" which some exhibit, and the "warmth and engagement" with which they "discourse of them," and what will you have left? You will have some of those acts of charity, and those labours, to which that zeal has led; but have you those "divine tempers and practices" that are the best evidences of a child of God? On the contrary, have you not often that violence and bitterness, that egotism and self-esteem, that exclusiveness of spirit and uncharitableness *against those who do not receive* "the gifts," that are, to say the least, strong counteracting evidences against those that appear more favourable? These moreover are the evidences to which, in such claimants, we ought *more particularly to look*, because if they are misled by the power of natural enthusiasm, their mistake cannot be traced in those evidences which their natural temperament would enable them to exhibit, but in those only where, if at all, the power of divine grace had enabled them to overcome constitutional infirmity. The great test of genuine piety in professedly religious men of warm feelings and impressible imaginations, is the purification of the *spirit* in the removal of the love of eminence and singularity, spiritual pride and self-opiniativeness. Zeal and ardour, and all their usual concomitants, are but poor evidences, comparatively, in *such* persons. Upon looking back at the cases of such claimants in the past history of the Church,

few, I suppose, will be inclined to deny that some cases may be accounted for in this way, even among those who have laid down their lives for the cause they were advocating, and therefore it is a point requiring no little circumspection and diligent inquiry and investigation, whether such claimants are what, by profession and external appearance, they seem to be; and whether, though they be in earnest and not hypocrites, they have not deceived *themselves* on the point, and have only the form of godliness, and are destitute of its power. This, I say, is a matter for inquiry and patient consideration. More than this I mean not to insinuate, and will at once express my strong persuasion, that there are among the present claimants and their supporters, as there have been in various similar cases in former times, many who are, in the usual acceptation of the words, really sincere and pious.[9]

[9] The following remarks, however, of Mr. M'Neile on this subject, in his valuable "Letters," published since the former edition of this work, are too important to be passed over in silence, especially as the testimony of one who speaks from intimate personal knowledge of the parties. "Whatever truth," he says, "there may be in the claim to superior holiness on behalf of some individuals connected with this delusion, I must deliberately deny the justice of it when advanced generally in support of the pretensions. The christian charity of their opponents has been signally manifested in the general and unexamined admission of this claim. But what is the fact? The fact is, that no such superiority exists. On the contrary, in all that belongs to meekness, and patience, and forbearance, and humility, and abstaining from *evil speaking*, they are far, very far, inferior to their Christian brethren. It is true indeed that they are beyond question more fervid in all their own peculiar ordinances, as to the times and places of their meetings, their modes of worship, and of the distribution among the poor of the Lord's bounties, as they call their collections; and, in a word, in all that belongs to the will-worship of their idol. So long as all this is attended to with unhesitating submission to the voice, every thing seems fair and attractive, and the conductors of the work seem amiable, and holy, and winning. But the moment any doubts are felt and expressed; the moment any thing approaching to reasonable evidence is required, or any reasonable objection is urged, against what happens to be the order of the day, the spell is broken. Instead of following the apostolical rule of 'in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves,' they denounce with a virulence truly terrific (and with an air of infallibility which would be ludicrous were it not so deplorable) the wickedness of 'sitting in judgment on the ways of the Lord,' 'defying the

Granting, therefore, by supposition, the truth of the first proposition, let us consider how far the second, or minor, stands good, viz.—That God will not allow sincere and pious persons, who pray to him for direction, to be, in such a matter, *even for a time*, deceived. The argument is certainly in very common use in such cases; as was said of Mr. Mason—"the holiness of his life makes it impossible that God should permit him to be deceived." This appears very plausible until it is examined; there is, as it were, a natural hope that it may be true. But, in the first place, if the existence of holiness in any man forbids the idea of his being deceived in a spiritual matter, which he has made the subject of prayer for direction, how is it that we have such a variety of opinions upon points of doctrine among those who are confessedly sincere and pious? And if apparent sincerity and piety are not sufficient to prove a man's *sentiments* correct, how can they be considered sufficient to establish extraordinary claims? Or if we are to limit the preservation from error to that error which is connected with the subject of spiritual gifts, are we to suppose that the *gift* of "discernment of spirits" must necessarily be given to every man that asks for it, and not by the Spirit, "as He willeth?" We have no intimation, moreover, in Scripture, that could lead us to depend on such a test as this, which, in fact, would almost supersede the scriptural tests.

Further; this argument, or assumption rather, is opposed to the clear testimony of numerous and indisputable facts. The case of Comenius, particularly, is decisive on this point. None ever called his piety in question; the evidences for it appear to have been of the highest kind. That he and his brethren made the case in which they were deceived, a subject of frequent and most earnest prayer to God for

Lord's orders,' 'presuming to use carnal reason after God has spoken, and profaning the ordinance of God's house.' All their seeming and boasted mildness is gone: and unless the recusant immediately submit his reason and his scriptural knowledge to the tyranny of the voice, crimination and recrimination are the consequence."—Letters to a friend; lett. vii. pp. 124, 5.

direction, we have his repeated testimony, and yet we find that after all they were wholly deluded in the matter. The same is to be said of many who were connected with the French and English prophets. Even their opponents, as we have seen, confessed that Satan had never more completely clothed himself as an angel of light; and the testimonies borne to the sincerity and piety of Mr. Lacy and Sir R. Bulkley, to mention no others, are quite unexceptionable.

But again; if an argument may be convicted of falsehood, by its proving too much, we have evidence against this which it will be difficult to answer. If this argument is true, it at once *unchristianizes* all but those who receive "the gifts." For if God will not allow any real Christian to be deceived in such a matter, then it follows, that if these are really "the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit," those who do not receive them cannot be real Christians. This conclusion flows so immediately and necessarily from their premises, that it is hardly consistent in them, not, long ago, to have stated as much, that they might at once have advertised their opponents, *i. e.* "the whole Christian Church," of the ground upon which they stood; whereas, hitherto, though they have not been sparing of opprobrious names, and denunciations of coming vengeance, they have shrunk from the idea of being supposed to charge them with anything more than *a deficiency in spirituality*. In this, however, there is a strange inconsistency; for whatever may be their want of spirituality, they are either children of God or they are not; there is no middle state; and the rejection of the gifts must, according to this argument, show that they are not; and this would be the best apology for the violent language with which they have been assailed. If, then, we venture to suppose, that in "the whole Christian Church" rejecting these gifts, some really sincere and pious persons may be found, either the gifts, or the argument, must be given up.

Moreover, why is it that Satan sometimes transforms himself into the appearance of an angel of light? Is it not that he may deceive *real* Christians? And is his labour

always lost? Is he never allowed for a time to mislead them? Nay, have not such, in former times particularly, been deceived by him in that garb into *open sin*, even the sin of intolerance, and thought all the while that they were doing God service? If, then, a man, after praying for *holiness*, may yet be left to be deceived by Satan, or "drawn away by his own lust," how much more may he who prays for *extraordinary gifts* be left open to delusion?

And *if* our modern claimants had been praying for gifts which they had no right to expect, even though they might erroneously think they had, and had thus brought themselves into a frame of mind in which they could not rest satisfied with God's ordinary dealings, and so laid themselves open to the deceits of the enemy, must we conclude that God would certainly interpose his aid, and preserve them from delusion in the matter? As well might we suppose, that a man who presumptuously exposed his life in the performance of any act of religious austerity, (such for instance, as the American, who died in attempting to fast forty days, in imitation of our Saviour,) would be miraculously preserved by God from the natural effect of his temerity. Their present delusion is merely the natural fruit and effect of *a previous delusion*, and one entirely originating with themselves, viz. the erroneous notion that they were entitled to expect the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit.

That one who really serves God and looks to him for guidance, should be *finally lost* through a mental error of this kind, is indeed far from what the writer can imagine; but that he should be preserved from all the errors to which his natural temperament or circumstances may expose him, is what neither Scripture, reason, nor experience, give us any ground to suppose.

It would be often hard, also, to show, that the mistake in which such conduct originates is not a culpable one,—one which might have been avoided. It must be remembered, that if a man give the rein to his imagination, and allow excited feelings to produce unwarrantable impressions upon his mind, and he thus becomes subject to their delu-

sive influence, when a proper exercise of his reason and judgment, in the first instance, would have saved him from this effect, the delusion under which he labours, if it does not proceed altogether from himself, is one to which he has rendered himself peculiarly liable.

Still more responsible is he for the delusion, if it has proceeded from, or been fostered by, the indulgence of expectations which "the whole Christian Church" has told him are unwarrantable. He may be sincere and pious, but he is culpable for having misused the faculties God has given him, and cherished unfounded notions against which he was warned; and is not surely *necessarily* exempt from the consequences of his error.

The passage of Scripture already quoted in the title-page appears to the writer most strongly confirmatory of this view, viz. the declaration of the angel to Daniel, that "some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end." (Dan. xi. 35.)

Why, indeed, should this be considered extraordinary, especially when, as in the present case, the delusion is confined to comparatively a few individuals? Granting that such persons are really sincere and pious, may there not have been at least many sins of ignorance for which God sees fit to correct them? Nay, more; may there not have been some workings of spiritual pride, or ambition, or self-opiniativeness, of which God may have suffered them so far to feel the effects as to fall, through the snares of Satan, into a delusion to which they had thus exposed themselves; or which at least was permitted to befall them, as the best and most fitting instrument to humble them and to teach them their peculiar weaknesses and infirmities? Such a method would certainly be quite agreeable to what has been generally considered God's usual mode of dealing with his servants; and while this may be the mean adopted with regard to *them*, other processes equally humiliating, though of a somewhat different nature, may be going on in the persons of others quite as sincere and pious as they are.

How far this may be the case generally with the present claimants, I leave the reader to judge; but I cannot but remind him, that there was a very general agreement in the Church that such characteristics marked, to a very lamentable extent, the commencement of his career, who, by his own account, quoted in Chap. I., led the way to, and has certainly been the chief instrument in supporting, the claims we are now considering. The reader, who has ever perused his publications, even of that period, will regard it as by no means an extraordinary sequel to them, that he should now take upon himself to "admonish" the General Assembly of his Church, and after two admonitions "reject" it—a declaration that bears upon the face of it a mockery of Scripture of the most painful kind. Now, is it inconsistent with the usual course of God's dealings with his servants, that in any such case a man should be suffered to reap the fruits of the sins of the spirit in arriving at a state of delusion, either through natural causes or satanic influence, to which he had thus exposed himself? The delusion of Comenius and of Mr. Mason, to mention no others, appears, as far as we can judge, to have proceeded from causes involving far less criminality than these; but yet we find that it was not inconsistent with God's dealings with his children, for such it cannot be doubted were both these good men.

There are, indeed, various purposes which such dispensations may answer, suitable to the divine character. Upon the persons themselves, where, as in the case of Comenius, they are undeceived in this life, they may be instrumental in the hand of God in bringing the weak and restless and imaginative into a state of sobriety of mind, and in humbling the pride and lofty imaginations of the enthusiastic egotist, and showing him the degree and nature of his weakness; and where they die under the delusion, as poor Mr. Mason, the dispensation is much like that in which a believer dies under the effect of bodily sickness contracted by any culpable imprudence. We have as good reason to suppose, in the one case as in the other, that though the

natural effect of culpable conduct is allowed to take its course, in the one case producing mental error, and in the other bodily disease and death, yet that where there is real penitence for all known sin and a simple reliance upon the atonement of Christ, there will be forgiveness for the guilt of both.

To the members of the Church at large, also, such occurrences are full of instruction and admonition. To whatever particular cause we may attribute the delusion, it teaches us a lesson both of the weakness of man and the power of the great enemy, (for that he has more or less to do with it can hardly be questioned,) which, in the absence of such a living testimony, we should find it difficult to realize. Nor let us fail to remember, that if a culpable remissness in guarding against the effects of natural temperament in producing mental error, may be allowed by God to lead to a state of partial delusion, how much more heavily may we expect that many other sins may be visited, for which the strength of natural corruption is too often pleaded as a palliative.

It is worthy of remark to those who are inclined to attach any weight to the argument we have just been considering, that the excellent Comenius, even while under the delusion by which he was led astray, distinctly avowed his conviction that sincerity and piety give no security against a man's being deceived by the wiles of Satan. A "pious and learned writer," as Comenius calls him, writing against Drabicius in particular, said, "It will no doubt appear hard, that a pious man, *exiled from his country for the confession of the truth*, should be left so destitute of the protection of God, as to be deceived by such an impure spirit; but to those who seriously consider the Holy Scriptures, it ought not to seem so wonderful, that even pious men can be deceived by that artful and subtile spirit, who can transform himself into [the appearance of] an angel of light, nay, pass himself off as Christ and God himself. For this truly is the lot of the pious, that we should be proved by many temptations on the

right hand and on the left.[1] To which Comenius replies, "That it is possible for even *the truly pious* to be deceived by Satan, as you admonish us, is certain; and that this is possible not only as it respects a private individual, but a whole church, the example of the Galatians shows. Therefore from the very beginning of the visions of Drabicius I began to be in fear, and never ceased to admonish the brethren, that they should watch unto prayer, and the exercises of penitence . . . May God at length have mercy upon us, that if we have not sufficiently known how to take heed of snares, we may yet at length be freed from them."[2]

Would that the spirit of our modern claimants were like that which is here displayed! There would then be better hope of their being, at least ultimately, guided into the way of truth.

There is, also, generally, as we may observe in the cases above mentioned, another attendant upon such manifestations as those we are here considering, which tends not a little to carry away and deceive the minds of the generality, viz. unusual fluency and power in prayer or preaching. When persons unaccustomed to public speaking, find themselves on a sudden enabled to speak freely, and discourse without premeditation, fluently, and even eloquently, on the great truths of religion, they naturally feel some surprise, and are unable to account even to themselves for the command of language and power of eloquence which they have thus acquired, and too readily come to the conclusion, that there must be something *supernatural* in it, when in fact it may be as natural, under the circumstances of religious excitement in which they have been

[1] Historia Revel. pp. 237, 238.

[2] "Posse a Satana etiam verè piis illudi (ut mones) certum est: nec privatim duntaxat alicui, sed et toti Ecclesiæ, Galatarum exemplum ostendit. Ideo ego mox a Drabiciniarum visionum initio prætimere cœpi, confratresque ut precibus et pœnitentiæ exercitiis excubarent, monere non destiti. . . . Deus nostri jam tandem misereatur, ut, si laqueos præcavere non satis scivimus, ab illis tamen tandem liberemur." Hist. Rev. p. 240.

placed, as the exhibition of extraordinary courage or extraordinary strength under other circumstances of excitement.

The general observations made in a preceding part of this chapter, on the power of such excitement over the mind, must, if they have any weight with the reader, leave but little doubt that it is quite equal to produce this effect.

It is very doubtful whether the antient heathen themselves intended to be understood literally, when they talked of their orators speaking by the help of God, when they appeared to be gifted with more than ordinary power; but certainly the more philosophical among them entertained no such notion, and attributed it to temporary excitement. "If," says Quintilian, "a sudden heat and excitement hath seized any one, it frequently happens that his success in his extempore effusion is greater than he can attain by care and premeditation. The antient orators used to say when this happened, that God was then present, as Cicero tells us. But the reason of the thing is manifest; for emotions strongly conceived, and the images of things when newly impressed on the mind, are carried into utterance by a continuous impulse, which sometimes in the delay of studied composition grow cool, and being put aside for a time do not return." [3]

Now, there is no subject with which the mind can be exercised so calculated to rouse its feelings as religion; no images that can make a deeper impression upon it than those created by the sublime truths of revelation. Hence if by intense meditation, or by the effect of example, or by eloquence, or more especially by the desire of appearing inspired, the natural enthusiasm of a man be excited, and thus the animal spirits be put into quick motion and influ-

[3] "Si quem calor ac spiritus tulit, frequenter accidit ut successum extemporalem consequi cura non possit. Deum tunc adfuisse, cum id evenisset, veteres oratores, ut Cicero dicit, aiebant. Sed ratio manifesta est. Nam bene concepti affectus et recentes rerum imagines continuo impetu feruntur, quæ nonnunquam mora styli refrigescunt, et dilatæ non revertuntur." Quintil. Instit. Orat. x. 7.

ence the brain, so that the feelings are strongly roused, and the images of things flow in rapidly and vividly upon the mind, the religious enthusiast is gifted with powers almost as superior to those possessed by one whose theme is earth and its concerns, as that which is divine and heavenly, and of eternal moment, is superior to that which is created and earthly, and of a fleeting and perishing nature. The very idea of being actuated by a supernatural impulse would give life and energy to the speaker, such as a Demosthenes might fail of exciting in himself if he supposed himself to be left to his own resources. It is quite notorious to all who have the least knowledge of human nature, and still more to those who have any acquaintance with any of the authors who have written on the subject, that the great requisite for enabling a person to shine in that moving style of eloquence which these persons affect, is, to raise the animal spirits to an extraordinary degree of excitement; by which the powers of the mind are roused into vigorous action, and its conceptions carried into utterance by an impulse which it is more difficult to resist than to find words to give it vent. The effect thus produced is so perfectly natural, that examples of a similar kind are abundant. We talk in common parlance of a man's being *inspired* by some beautiful prospect, or by the invigorating air of a fine morning, or a salubrious climate, because his mind seems then to expand, his ideas rise in quick succession, and his words flow from him so as to show more or less of the temporary excitement. What is this, then, but an acknowledgment, that when the animal spirits are excited, they influence the brain, and put the powers of the mind into lively action, so as to give them *extraordinary* vigour? And what, let me ask, can be a more exciting scene to one at all *doubtful* upon the subject of such manifestations, than Mr. Irving's chapel, where solemn silences, ardent prayers for the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, moving eloquence on the same subject, or on the sublime truths of revelation, or some prophetic speculations, alternate with unearthly

"utterances" supposed to proceed from the mouth of God himself? And however frequently "the gift" may have been exercised *afterwards* in other places, this was the scene, or one similar to it, of its supposed *bestowal* in the case of almost all who have exercised it; and, as the example of Mr. Nicholson [4] proves, *such* a "gift," after it has been once exercised, needs no excitement to procure its return.

The vivid imagery which, in such cases, often rises upon the mind, (the miscalled visions of the enthusiast,) and all the conceptions with which it then teems, will of course arise out of the subject of its immediate contemplations. And the more powerful the pressure upon the mind, the more vigorous, lively, and pertinent will be its conceptions, and the more active will be the memory in recalling past impressions, and consequently the more striking and affecting will be the utterance that flows from the lips. The moving discourse, then, the recitation and pertinent application of Scripture, (not to mention that former examples have completely set them aside as evidences of divine inspiration) [5] ought, under such circumstances, to surprise no one when coming from any who have had only the *usual* advantages which fall to the lot of almost all in a Christian land. And it is important to observe, that, supposing the real cause of these utterances to be such as we have suggested, the effect produced by it, when acting powerfully, would be, as we have already hinted in the former part of this chapter, just that which is witnessed in these persons, viz. the loss, more or less, of the power of self-control.

It is not, then, absolutely necessary, to qualify a man for such occasional, be they *frequent*, feats of eloquence, that he should have a more than ordinary portion of natural enthusiasm. There are many other causes sufficient to produce such an excitement as that of which we have been speaking. It may be produced by too intense and long-continued meditations, and the en-

[4] See pp. 194—196 above. [5] See p. 164 above.

couragement of devotional fervors; by the ardent desire and expectation of an extraordinary gift and divine influence, which causes a man to mistake the mere impetus of the animal spirits for the operation of the Spirit of God, and to be carried on by the very delusion itself; and more especially by the powerful effect of another's eloquence, who, if he possess a more than ordinary share of natural enthusiasm, can hardly fail of communicating much of it to those who hang upon his lips, and wish to imbibe his spirit.

And if a very small portion of natural ardour of mind be combined with these external causes of excitement, though it may have been up to that time almost dormant, from having had no adequate stimulus to rouse it into action, it will add to them tenfold weight.

Whether, then, our present claimants are or are not persons of much natural enthusiasm, yet if there have been those powerful causes of excitement operating upon them to which we have just alluded, this is abundantly sufficient to explain the effect which has been produced.

It is yet further to be considered, that, in judging of the real natural character of individuals, we must take into the account, and give great weight to, the circumstances in which they have been placed; and our necessarily imperfect knowledge of these, in most cases, should make us very careful in our decisions on such a subject; and therefore doubly cautious how we argue in favour of extraordinary claims from the supposed judiciousness of those who advocate them. Thus much, also, we may safely say—and let the reader understand that it is said with a particular reference to some of the principal of our modern supposed prophets—that when persons, who, while under the ministrations of what we should call sober-minded and really spiritual pastors, have appeared like-minded with them, voluntarily subject themselves to those causes of excitement we have mentioned, and reap the natural consequences, their former conduct, *when considered in connexion with that which has succeeded it*, affords no proof of real genuine solidity

of mind. There is, perhaps, an equal probability, that they are the mere creatures of circumstances.

When once the rein has been given to that natural enthusiasm of which almost every man possesses some portion, so that the mind is subject to its intoxicating influence, the rapid flow of eloquence which may rush from the lips upon the subject on which that enthusiasm is exercised, and which may appear to an inexperienced observer, and even to the man himself, like inspiration, is no more extraordinary or supernatural than the effusions of the poet or the orator, under the effect of similar excitement; for such effects are not confined in the latter case, any more than in the former, to persons of learning and education. And the "power," or, in other words, the zeal and ardor with which he delivers himself, may be no more supernatural than another man's speaking with a pleasing voice. Certainly the self-inflictions of the Indian devotee seem much more to require supernatural aid than such exhibitions as these, and among their own countrymen this is the idea entertained respecting them; but I suppose our modern prophets themselves will agree, that the extraordinary cruelties which these men inflict upon themselves, and the extraordinary manner in which they endure them, are nothing but the effects of that religious ardor and enthusiastic habit to which they have brought themselves, and which, however remarkable, are by no means supernatural; for should they suppose, from their being connected with a false religion, that they are effected by the power of Satan, it would be most easy to adduce examples more than equal to them among the savages of America which were merely instances of political courage and heroism.

This opinion, indeed, is so amply supported by facts, and established by eminent writers, that it will, no doubt, at once be acknowledged *in theory* as a well-known truth by many of those whose claims we are here considering, who are willing, for obvious reasons, to allow all these things; but not so, at least practically, as it respects their younger

and more inexperienced followers, whose wonder and admiration are as much called forth by such exhibitions as that of a rustic at the astronomer who foretells an eclipse, and for the same reason. To give, therefore, one authority upon this subject, I will just add the following brief extract from an eminent writer, Dr. Henry More, whose evidence is of more value here, from his having had himself no inconsiderable share of natural enthusiasm, as any account of him will sufficiently prove to the reader.

"The enthusiast," he says, "in one of his melancholy intoxications, which he may accelerate by solemn silence and intense and earnest meditation, finding himself therein so much beyond himself, conceits it a *sensible presence of God, and a supernatural manifestation of the Divinity*, which must needs raise that passion of veneration, and most powerful devotion, which consists of love, fear, and joy; which *single* passions have been able to kill men, or cast them into a trance; how can they, then, if they be well followed by imagination and desire in the enthusiast of a nearer union with this inward light, fail to cast him into tremblings, convulsions, apoplexies, ecstacies, and what not."[6] It is a strong temptation, he observes, with such a person, "when he feels a storm of devotion or zeal come upon him like a mighty wind, his heart being full of affection, his head pregnant with clear and sensible representations, and his mouth flowing and streaming with fit and powerful expressions, such as would astonish an ordinary auditory to hear; it is, I say, a shrewd temptation to him to think, that it is the very Spirit of God that then moves supernaturally in him, when as all that excess of zeal, and affection, and fluency of words, is most palpably to be resolved into the power of . . . . a kind of natural inebriation. And that there is nothing better than nature in it, it is evident, both from the experience of good and discreet men . . . and also from what all

[6] Dr. H. More's "Enthusiasmus Triumphatus, or, a Discourse on Enthusiasm." London, 1656. 8vo. § 29

may observe in those that have been wicked, mad, and blasphemous, and yet *have surpassed* in this mistaken gift of prayer, as is notorious in Hacket, who was so besotted with a conceit of his own zeal and eloquence, that he fancied himself the Holy Ghost."[7] "And, hence, whatever credit the enthusiast may conciliate to himself, from his moving eloquence, his mysterious style, and unexpected motions," they are easily to be accounted for from the excitement under which he labours, which "cannot fail to enable the tongue to tell her story with a great deal of life and affection; and the imagination is so extravagant that it is far easier for her to ramble abroad and fetch in some odd skue conceit from a remote obscure corner, than to think of what is nearer and more ordinarily intelligible."[8]

Of the case of Hacket, mentioned in this extract, Casaubon tells us, "It is observed by many, that he was so ardent in his devotions that he would ravish all that heard him; whereof some also he infected with the venom of his opinions with no other engine but that very charm of his ardent praying."[9] And so Hadrian Saravia, as quoted by Casaubon, says of him:—"This Hacket is reported to have excelled so much in praying extempore, that those two [his disciples] did verily believe him altogether to have been inflamed (or, wholly possest,) by the Spirit of God, and that his tongue was governed by him; and such admirers were they of him, that as they believed there was nothing but he might obtain by his prayers from God, so consequently nothing that he desired but he might effect."[1]

The same is said also of Swenckfield, David George, and many other, indeed almost all, such enthusiasts.

Thus much, then, for the effects of mere *natural excitement*. But at the same time I am far from denying, and indeed think it very probable, that such persons may often be under the influence, and assisted by the power, of an

[7] Ibid. § 16.
[8] Ibid. § 59.
[9] Casaubon on Enthusiasm, p. 278.
[1] Ibid. pp. 278, 9.

evil spirit in these manifestations. In the case of children particularly, it seems difficult, and almost impossible, to account for such occurrences, but on the supposition of their being under some supernatural influence; and as the possibility of such a thing as satanic possession and consequent eloquence, even in divine things, is not doubted, but, in fact, advocated by those whose claims we are considering, it is unnecessary to do more than to point the reader's attention to the proofs we have given in former parts of this book, of the *perfect* manner in which Satan can act his part as an angel of light; and hence urge him to *act* upon the conviction,—which, whatever may be their opinion in theory, many find it difficult to realize in practice,—that an apparently deep acquaintance with religion, and a ready utterance of divine truths and spiritual phrases, have no *necessary* connexion with the wisdom that cometh from above.

However plausible, therefore, such arguments—those, that is, that are derived from the piety and wonderful effusions of the supposed prophets,—may be, they have no real weight, and ought not to deceive any. For, as we have seen, it is quite possible that a man may have the best evidences of sincerity and piety, may discourse on the deep mysteries of God with the greatest eloquence and power, and show an extensive, spiritual, and apparently supernatural acquaintance with religion, and yet only be speaking under the effect of natural excitement, or satanic influence, and be intermixing with what is good the most unauthorized statements and predictions.

Another argument greatly relied upon, apparently, by those who have actually received such claimants, always is, the *internal witness*, borne by their own hearts to the truth of the supposed divine exhortations, which, if we do not receive, they argue that we must either impeach their veracity or suppose that they have not the Holy Spirit; and at least, that this witness cannot be disregarded by *them*; and further, that they have an evidence of the di-

vine origin of those exhortations, in the fact that they tend to promote their edification and holiness. I answer, what are *the grounds and evidences* upon which this internal witness is founded? These *grounds and evidences* at least ought not to be internal but external, such as are *suited* to produce conviction in the mind of any rational being. If it is a mere matter of *feeling*, a mere passive impression, it is an insufficient testimony not only to others, but to *the party entertaining it.* And in denying its correctness, we neither impeach the veracity of the party, nor suppose such a person wholly destitute of the Spirit's favour and guidance; because we know that other sincere and pious persons have been similarly deluded before, and that there may be many reasons why their *voluntary* error may, certainly for a time, be permitted. The value of that internal witness, then, depends altogether upon *the grounds* on which the spirit or mind has come to the conclusion, and *for that conclusion it is responsible.* It is quite true, indeed, that the testimony of a man's own spirit must be his guide in all matters, but to *justify him in entertaining, and still more in acting upon, that testimony*, he must be able to show grounds for it, such as any other intelligent mind can appreciate. To rest upon *feeling*, or even the supposed dictates of conscience, what ought to be determined by the voice of reason, is mere self-deception. It is a common saying, that the voice of conscience is the voice of God; and there is much truth in the remark: but it must be recollected that conscience may be blinded by prejudices, warped by the feelings, swayed by circumstances, so as to give a partial testimony; nay, overwhelmed and silenced under the voice of feeling, which may be mistaken for it. And after all, the saying is no more an axiom to argue from in any particular case than is another of the same kind, viz. the old proverb, that the voice of the people is the voice of God. Neither of these is to be understood *literally.*

It is, therefore, further argued, that they have an evidence of the divine origin of those effusions in their ten-

dency to promote their edification and holiness. Now without denying that this may for a time be their tendency, this fact furnishes no proof of the point sought to be established, for we have had abundant evidence that such exhortations may proceed from Satan, and answer his purposes in various ways, and are in fact necessary to the perfection of his deceptions. And what, let me ask, will be the *ultimate* effect of these manifestations if it turn out that the work is not of God, and that those who have been engaged in it, however sincere, have been deceived? Will there be no rebellious thoughts against God? Will there be no unbelieving thoughts even as to Christianity itself? And where will the blame rest but with themselves, who by encouraging expectations which the whole Christian Church warned them were unwarrantable, had laid themselves open to the deceits of the enemy?

This whole argument has been repeated in every delusion of the kind from the times of the apostles downward; and I would only further ask any one who is inclined to attach any weight to it, what sort of an argument he would have thought it, had it been urged against *him* by a follower of Johanna Southcote when her delusion was in vogue?

It is to be observed, also, that in estimating the pretensions of such claimants, several points are to be considered, which, notwithstanding the possession of extraordinary gifts, and the other evidences we have noticed, are *essential* criteria of their character. One of the most important of these, as we have already observed, is their *doctrine*, to which, as it respects the present case, I shall take an opportunity of calling the attention of the reader hereafter.[2] There are also several others, for in most of the cases enumerated above, such persons have been free from fundamental heresy, though deceivers both of themselves and others. It has apparently been the policy of Satan *in general* to connect such claims only, *as far as peculiarity of*

[2] See Appendix.

doctrine is concerned, with declarations relating to awful judgments about to be inflicted on the world, and the speedy appearance of Christ upon earth to establish his kingdom here; the former of which being evidently the subject of prophecy in the word of God, and the latter a controverted point in the Church, afford no solid grounds in themselves for determining the nature of their pretensions. Hence, if we even suppose them free from fundamental error in doctrine, various other points must be considered.

It is worth notice, then, in the first place, whether the mind, the temperament, the age, or the sex of the party, lays the person particularly open to delusion, which would make it necessary to examine *very* narrowly into the supposed manifestations of the Spirit. More especially are the *spirit* and the *language* of such claimants to be observed, whether they bear upon them the characteristics of the Spirit of Christ. Moreover the prophecies themselves are to be carefully observed, whether they are *definite*, and really speak of things beyond the ken of human foresight; whether if there be more than one such claimant, their declarations *mutually agree;* and whether their prophecies are *accurately fulfilled.* All these points are essential criteria of a true prophet, so that an evident failure in *one* of them is *fatal* to a man's pretensions to that character.

Let us observe the *spirit* and *language* of our modern claimants. For an illustration of their spirit we need only refer to the extracts already given in Chap. I., from the preface to "The General Delusion of Christians."[3] The acrimonious bitterness of invective against the whole Church with which that preface abounds, unredeemed by the least display of feeling for the fate there supposed to await it, carries in every line the evidence of its origin, at least that it does not come from the Spirit of Christ. And the same spirit, according to all accounts, pervades their prophetic effusions. It is remarkable how uniformly (as Milner has

[3] If any further evidence were wanting, any number of "The Morning Watch" would supply it.

observed) false claimants to the prophetic character are characterized by such a violent and uncharitable spirit, and particularly how similar and almost identical are the points in which this spirit has chiefly displayed itself in such manifestations;—the limitation of the true spiritual church to one little party, the unmeasured abuse of the standing ministry, and the general arrogance of their pretensions. As Jerome observes of the false teachers of his day, they "assume to themselves so great authority, that whether they teach to the right hand or to the left, that is, whether they teach good or evil, they will not allow their followers to reason on the matter, but only to follow them as their leaders."[4]

Now these are just the characteristics of the religion of the natural enthusiast. The excellent Brainerd, speaking in his preface to Shepard's Diary of those whose religion is "built upon imagination, strong impressions, and sudden suggestions made to their minds," says, "they are usually extreme confident, as if *immediately informed from God*, not only of the goodness of their own state, but of their infallible knowledge and absolute certainty of the truth of every thing they pretend to under the notion of religion; and thus all reasoning with some of them is utterly excluded. But 'tis remarkable of these, that they are extremely deficient in regard of true poverty of spirit . . . . as also in regard of meekness, love, and gentleness towards mankind . . . At the same time, when they are so extremely deficient in regard of these precious divine tempers which have been mentioned, they are usually full of zeal, concern, and fervency, in the things of religion, and often discourse of them with much warmth and engagement: and *to those who don't know, or don't consider, wherein the essence of true religion consists, viz. in being conformed to the image of Christ, not in point of zeal and fervency only, but in all divine tempers and practices—I say, to those who don't*

[4] "Qui tantam sibi assumunt auctoritatem, ut seu dextera doceant seu sinistra, id est, sive bona sive mala, nolint discipulos ratione discutere, sed se præcessores sequi." Hieron. in Is. xxx. 21. Ed. Bened. vol. 3, pt. 1, col. 258.

duly observe and distinguish, they often appear like the best of men." To which President Edwards adds, "'Tis common with this sort of people to say, that *God is amongst them, his Spirit accompanies their exhortations and other administrations, and they are sealed by the Holy Ghost* in the remarkable success they have, in the great affections that are stirred up in God's people, &c., but to insinuate, on the contrary, that *he is not with their opponents, and particularly that God has forsaken the standing ministry, and that the time is come when it is the will of God that they should be put down, and that God's people should forsake them, and that no more success is to be expected to attend their administrations.*"[5]

The exact coincidence of these characteristics with those of the case now under consideration, cannot fail to strike the reader; and to such we may at once reply in the words of St. Paul, "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge, and though I have all faith so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." (1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2.)

Again, let us notice the *language* of such claimants. Their pretensions are, that they speak as the passive organs of the Spirit's utterance, and hence their supposed messages from God are generally, and if they were consistent, ought always to be, delivered *in the first person.* Hence their language is such as this:—"I," says Maximilla, "am the Word, the Spirit, and the Power." "I," says Montanus, "am the Lord God Almighty dwelling in man."[6] "I," says Mr. Lacy, "will show myself a merciful God."—"I am a pure spirit, not mixed with a body, that speaks to you . . . . My Scriptures they are a sure word of prophecy, and whatever does disagree with them

[5] Edwards's Account of the Life of the late Rev. Mr. Brainerd. Boston, N. E. 1749, 8vo. pp. 290, 291.

[6] See pp. 107, 109 above.

is not from me, who am all one from the beginning of the world unto the end."[7] "If ye, O vessel, who speak," says Mr. Baxter, "refuse to speak the word, ye shall utterly perish."[8] And as might naturally be expected under such circumstances, whenever discourses of any length are attempted, the speaker, *forgetting at times the nature even of his own pretensions*, falls into the most ridiculous inconsistency, and confusion of the first and third persons, as may be seen throughout Mr. Lacy's Warnings.

Such, however, is their general language, and that which is alone accordant with their pretensions; and if it is the Holy Spirit who speaks personally through them in the way that accords with their notions, it is language to which no one can object. Now, let the reader who has the slightest acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures, judge how far this language is characteristic of a true prophet. Is there one instance on record of a true prophet using language like this? And is it not in fact totally opposed to that of all the prophets both of the Old and New Testament? The primitive Church, as we have already seen, considered such language identical with blasphemy; and it does indeed betray a species of arrogance which it is difficult to describe by any milder appellation. This, then, it must be remembered, is the language that necessarily characterizes, and indeed is inseparable from, the effusions of all those who suppose that the Holy Spirit speaks personally through them, as his passive organs of utterance.

The subtilty of this delusion is principally seen in its enabling a person to assume the garb of humility, while he is at the same time attracting to himself, from those who believe his pretensions, all the attention and respect with which the personal presence of God himself could inspire them. Such humility is very like that of the Pope, who, while he calls himself "the servant of the servants of God," contrives, by claiming to be God's vicegerent, to

[7] Lacy's Warnings, pp. 50, 54; and *passim*.

[8] Baxter's Narrative, p. 27.

obtain almost divine honours, and to "sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

It is quite immaterial whether the precise terms, "I am God," or, "I am the Holy Spirit," or such like, have yet been used by our modern pretenders, because, whether they have been used or not, such language is not only strictly suitable to their pretensions, but in fact *always implied when they use the first person*, and such as, allowing them to be what they claim to be, the passive organs of the Spirit's utterance, could excite no surprise or reprobation. If, then, there are any among them who shrink from allowing these words to escape their lips, let them in common consistency shrink from the pretensions which naturally and necessarily lead to such a result.

In the present case, also, it is impossible to deny that at least many of their prophecies have not been fulfilled,[9] and that they do not mutually agree;[1] nor is (or, was) this denied, but an attempt made to account for it by supposing "*that the same person might at one moment speak by the Spirit of God, and the next moment by an evil spirit.*"[2]

It is mercifully ordered that such delusions as those we are considering should always, sooner or later, expose themselves in this way. Mr. Baxter noticed in his Narrative some of the palpable self-contradictions and internal dissensions that had *then* appeared among them.[3] Of the latter there has been lately, and now exists, a remarkable instance in the schism among them at Port Glasgow, the M'Donald family (mentioned above, p. 16), so highly spoken of in the Morning Watch, (No. 8, pp. 869—73, and 948,) having completely separated themselves from Mr. Irving and his party, and denounced them as in error, and therefore of course actuated only by natural enthusiasm or an evil spirit; a denunciation which of course is fulminated back upon them by the opposite party, and therefore we have now to choose between these two parties which of them is really

[9] See pp. 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 34, 38, above.

[1] See pp. 33, 4, above. [2] See p. 38, above.

[3] See pp. 33, 34, 42, above, and the "Narrative" in various places.

possessed of the Spirit; for although upon our principles, such divisions in the Church may be accounted for, it is quite impossible to suppose that the Holy Spirit would utter contradictory statements.

It is also well known that some of them are now anxious to shift their ground in one point, finding it untenable, viz. that when speaking by the Spirit (as they suppose) they speak by constraint, or as the mere organs of utterance to the Spirit; but the testimony formerly borne to this matter by THE SUPPOSED PROPHETS THEMSELVES, that they did speak by a power which they could not control, and as the passive organs of the Spirit's utterance, is so overwhelming (see pp. 19, 20, 22, 23, 28, 41, 44, above) that if they now say they do not so speak, they must acknowledge that "the power" now acts quite differently to what it did, and quite differently to the manner in which they *then* said it *must act if divine.* (See pp. 20, 44, &c. above.) Such a change, then, is one of the best proofs of delusion that can be afforded; more especially if, as I have sufficient reason to think is the case, they are *at variance among themselves on the point.* It is very curious, that the very same self-contradiction and shuffling on this point marked the case of the French and English prophets, who, setting out with the same pretensions, afterwards abandoned the ground as untenable. But such a delusion as this, is, and ever has been, a mere Proteus. You may compel it to abandon one form, but only that it may glide imperceptibly into another. And the most remarkable fact of all is, that they who see and know the existence of all these absurdities, internal dissensions, contradictions, and shiftings, still adhere to the party, and suppose them to be under the *immediate* influence of the Holy Spirit. May God in his mercy pardon such an abuse of the reason he has bestowed upon them. But fearful must be the account to be given hereafter by those who have been their leaders in these things.

There is nothing, perhaps, that more exposes a person to the snares of satan than an eagerness for miracles and re-

velations. It is one of the very things which our Lord himself rebuked in the Jews: "Except ye see signs and wonders ye will not believe." (John iv. 48.) If, moreover, they are so essential as some seem to think them to be, it is, to say the least, hard to conceive that the Church would have been left so destitute of them; for were we even to grant all that is asserted on this subject in a work lately published, [4] most of us probably would be inclined to think, that no such event has occurred in the Church for the last 1500 years so miraculous as the paucity of those that can be shown to be such. Not to say that if they *were* continually occurring, they would no more be miracles than the rotation of the earth, or the motions of the heavenly bodies.

There were certainly plenty of claimants in the middle ages to the honour of receiving revelations and even working miracles; but this is a very left-handed support to the cause, for as Fuller observes, in his History of the Holy War, "One may *wonder* that the world should see most visions when it was most blind; and that that age most barren in learning should be most fruitful in revelations." [5]

It is clear, indeed, that the power of working miracles was not bestowed upon the general body of believers even in the earliest times of the Church, for all the signs, wonders, and miracles recorded in the Acts, except speaking in tongues and prophesying, are mentioned as having been done by the apostles and one or two remarkable individuals, such as Stephen the proto-martyr, and Barnabas. (See Acts ii. 43; v. 12, 15; xiv. 3; xv. 12.) This would hardly have been the case had such a power been communicated to believers in general. Nay the power of working them was not always present with the apostles themselves, as is proved by Phil. ii. 27; and 2 Tim. iv. 20. Of the promise, "These signs shall follow them that believe, in my name shall they cast out devils, &c." (Mark xvi. 15—18) the fulfilment is distinctly recorded in ver. 20—"And they went forth and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and *confirming the word with signs following.*" It requires

[4] Boys's Suppressed Evidence, &c. 1832. 8vo. [5] Book i. c. 8.

very strong proof, then, that this is not a *sufficient* fulfilment of the promise, and that we are to look for a further fulfilment of it now, when miracles appear to have ceased for so long a time, and when *as it respects all those who believe the records of the New Testament, the great end of miracles, viz. the "confirmation of the word" delivered by Christ and his apostles, has long ago been attained.*

The fact of the cessation of miracles during the last fifteen hundred years, is in one place manifestly allowed by Mr. Irving to be a thing very possible, and accounted for, with a coolness that almost makes one shudder, by supposing the whole Christian world during that period, collectively and individually, to have been destitute of any spiritual knowledge of the Gospel. "These [he says, after enumerating what he conceives to be the principal doctrines of the Gospel] are the realities of Christ's consummate work, which being preached, God seals with a first fruits of the very thing declared; but these have no more in an open manner been declared in this island, or, I may say, *in Christendom, since the first three centuries, than in regions which the Gospel hath not visited, and so* THERE HAS BEEN NOTHING TO SEAL TO."[5] And again, at a subsequent period, this is clearly assumed by him to be the fact, and similarly accounted for. "How should we mourn now that we have discovered that for fifteen hundred years and more the Church hath been shutting her door against the glory of Christ, rejecting the Spirit of power, and keeping herself in misery and the world in darkness—hiding from the sight of men the beauty and blessedness of Christ in his Church . . . . . for long long ages she hath been living in the rejection of Christ glorified and in the despite of the Holy Spirit of grace—knowing Christ some little in the flesh, but refusing to know him in the Spirit—ignorant of the power of his resurrection, not baptized into the fellowship of his sufferings and little conformed to his death."[6]

[5] See Morn. Watch, No. 8, (published Dec. 1830,) p. 869.

[6] Fraser's Magazine for March, 1832.

To assert that there will be no revival of miraculous powers in the Church, either for the confirmation of her faith in any time of peculiar trouble, or for the conviction of unbelievers, is more than the writer would feel authorized to do. But at the same time he may be allowed to express his conviction, that signs and wonders are more especially intended for professed unbelievers, as the apostle appears to intimate; (1 Cor. xiv. 22;) and that they certainly are not *now* legitimate objects of desire to professed Christians.

The word of Christ and his apostles has been already confirmed by them. A repetition of them could only answer the same purpose, and therefore is unnecessary;—unnecessary, as it appears to me, even for the heathen, because the testimonies to the genuineness, authenticity, and credibility of the Scriptures, are sufficient for the conviction of human reason. As to any thing in Scripture authorizing the expectation of such a revival, there is nothing of the kind. The only passage at all tending that way is the famous prophecy of Joel, which, as we have already observed, (p. 2,) is said by St. Peter (Acts ii. 16–18,) to have been fulfilled in his time. [7]

If, indeed, our modern pretenders claimed to be the introducers of a new revelation, then it would be reasonable to expect that their claims should be confirmed by signs and wonders, but this does not appear to be the case; and if it were, I should seek no other reply to them than that given by the beloved apostle, in the book of his Revelation,—"I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. He who testifieth

[7] Their complete and most unfounded misapplication of the scriptural expression "the latter rain," as if it referred to such an event, is fully and ably exposed by Mr. M'Neile, in his "Letters," lett. 8.

these things saith, Surely I come quickly." (Rev. xxii. 18—20.)

Were it necessary, it would be easy to multiply authorities for this opinion from the writings of all the most eminent Fathers and Reformers of the Church; but the author has already exceeded his proposed bounds. Some testimonies on this point have already been given, in the first chapter, from Augustine and Chrysostom, to which I shall only add here the following.

The former of these, Augustine, in one of his Pentecostal sermons, thus cautions his hearers on this subject: "The Holy Spirit came, they were filled, they began to speak in the various tongues of all nations . . . The Scriptures themselves teach us, that after the men believed, they were baptized, they received the Holy Spirit, they spoke in the tongues of all nations. [Acts x. 46, &c.] . . . Is the Holy Spirit, then, brethren, not given now? Whoever thinks this, is not worthy to receive it. It is given now. Why, then, does no one speak in the tongues of all nations, as he spoke who was then filled with the Holy Spirit? Why? Because that which was signified by it is fulfilled . . . What was then promised is now fulfilled . . . Let no one, therefore, say, I have received the Holy Spirit, why do I not speak in the tongues of all nations? . . . IF YOU WOULD LIVE BY THE HOLY SPIRIT, HOLD FAST CHRISTIAN LOVE, ADHERE TO THE TRUTH, SEEK TO PROMOTE UNITY, THAT YOU MAY ATTAIN ETERNAL LIFE."[8]

And thus speaks Chrysostom;—"So, then, *to seek after miracles is the part of tempters of Christ*, both then and

[8] "Venit Spiritus Sanctus, impleti sunt, cœperunt loqui linguis variis omnium gentium . . . . Docent nos litteræ ipsæ, postea crediderunt homines, baptizati sunt, acceperunt Spiritum Sanctum, linguis omnium gentium locuti sunt. . . . Nunquid modò, fratres, non datur Spiritus Sanctus? Quisquis hoc putat non est dignus accipere. Datur et modò. Quare ergo nemo loquitur linguis omnium gentium, sicut loquebatur qui tunc Spiritu Sancto implebatur? Quare? Quia quod illud significabat, impletum est. . . Modò impletur quod tunc promittebatur. . . Nemo ergo dicat, accepi Spiritum Sanctum, quare non loquor linguis omnium gentium? . . . Si vultis vivere de Spiritu Sancto, tenete caritatem, amate veritatem, desiderate unitatem, ut perveniatis ad æternitatem." Serm. 267. Ed. Bened. tom. 5, col. 1089, 1090.

now. For there are also, even now, those who seek for them, and say, Why are there no miracles now? Because if your faith is what it ought to be, and you love Christ as you ought to love him, you have no need of miracles. For these things are given to unbelievers."[9]

And so Isidore of Seville, at the latter end of the sixth century, remarks,—"The reason why the Church does not now do the miracles it did under the apostles, is, because miracles were necessary then to convince the world of the truth of Christianity, but now it becomes it, being so convinced, to shine forth in good works. . . WHOEVER SEEKS TO PERFORM MIRACLES NOW AS A BELIEVER, SEEKS AFTER VAIN GLORY AND HUMAN APPLAUSE. For it is written, *Tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not.* Observe, a sign is not necessary for believers, who have already received the faith, but for unbelievers, that they may be converted. For Paul miraculously cured the father of Publius of a fever for the benefit of unbelievers; but he restores believing Timothy when ill, not by prayer, but by medicine; so that you may clearly perceive that miracles were wrought for unbelievers and not for believers."[1]

With the heathen, signs and miracles might have a very powerful tendency to convert them to Christianity. It is remarkable, however, that of the many pretenders to the

[9] Αρ' ουν το σημεια αιτειν πειραζοντων εστι και τοτε και νυν. Και γαρ και νυν εισιν οι ζητουντες και λεγοντες· δια τι μη και νυν σημεια γινεται; ει γαρ πιστος ει, ὡς ειναι χρη, και φιλεις τον Χριστον, ὡς φιλειν δει, ου χρειαν εχεις σημειων. Ταυτα γαρ τοις απιστοις διδοται. Chrysostom. hom. 24. in Johann. c. ii. v. 25. Op. Ed. Sav. vol. ii. p. 650.

[1] "Quod nunc Ecclesia non ea miracula faciat, quæ sub apostolis faciebat, ea causa est, quia tunc oportebat mundum miraculis [*al.* per miracula] credere, nunc vero jam credentem oportet bonis operibus coruscare . . . Jam fide miracula quicumque requirit, vanam gloriam ut laudetur quærit. Scriptum est enim, *linguæ in signum sunt non fidelibus sed infidelibus.* Ecce lignum [signum] non est fidelibus necessarium, qui jam crediderunt, sed infidelibus, ut convertantur. Nam Paulus pro non credentium infidelitate, patrem Publii de infirmitate febrium virtutibus curat; infirmantem vero Timotheum fidelem non oratione sed medicinaliter reparat, ut noveris miracula pro incredulis non pro fidelibus fieri." Isid. Hispal., Sententiarum, lib. 1, c. 27. Ed. Col. Agripp. 1617, p. 424.

possession of such gifts that have arisen in the Church, *none* have ever gone to disturb Satan's kingdom among the heathen, where their assumed gifts would, if real, be in general so much more suitable and beneficial. Thus far they certainly agree with Satan's policy, for he would be much too wise to lead them into his own kingdom, his only object being to weaken and harass the Church, " to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect."

The fact is, that miracles are not even essentially necessary attendants on a prophet. John the Baptist " did no miracle," but " there hath never arisen a greater prophet."

It appears, however, to the writer, that with respect to any claims to the prophetic character in the present day, we may go one step further, and assert, that the improbability of any revival of that gift under the present dispensation is, from the testimony of the word of God, so great, that, without venturing to decide that there never will be such an event, we ought to require evidence of a *peculiarly* strong kind before we admit that it has taken place.

Not to mention any of those numerous arguments that might be derived from the long apparent cessation of the prophetic gifts in the Church, as well as from the ends and purposes for which they appear to have been bestowed in former times, such as they would not answer in the present day, and other similar considerations,—which, at the same time, appear to the writer to carry with them considerable weight,—let us only notice what Scripture teaches us on the subject. We have already had occasion to observe,[2] that while our Lord and his apostles gave many warnings to the Church, that in the last days false prophets would arise and show great signs and wonders, they have not left on record one single promise or hint that there would be in those days any true prophets;—that the time of Christ's second coming, the favourite subject of prediction with our present and all similar pretenders, will not be foreknown by his own servants; and that, in fact, he inculcated upon all his fol-

[2] See pp. 1, 2, and 218, above.

lowers the necessity of watchfulness, *on the ground* that his coming would be unexpected.

Now, it so little accords with the usual mode of God's dealings with his Church, that prophets should be raised up as the harbingers of Christ's second coming, of whom there have been no previous predictions leading us to expect the appearance of such messengers, that on this ground alone we have reason to doubt it. And certainly there is not the most remote hint of such a thing in the whole of the New Testament. Nay, on the contrary, the language in which the second coming of Christ is spoken of, invariably represents it as coming suddenly and unexpectedly *upon all.* Thus, besides the passages already quoted, our Lord says *to his disciples*,—"Take ye heed, watch and pray, for ye know not when the time is. For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to *his servants*, and *to every man his work*, and commanded the porter to watch. Watch ye therefore, for *ye know not when the Master of the house cometh.*" (Mark xiii. 33—35.) And so he exhorts his disciples with the same reference, "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning, and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh they may open unto him immediately. . . . The Son of man cometh at an hour that *ye think not.*" (Luke xii. 35, 36, 40.) And so in the parabolical description of this event, recorded in the 25th of St. Matthew, the *first* cry that announces the coming of the bridegroom is made when the *time for preparation* for that event is *over;* and the lesson deduced is this; "watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." (See Matthew xxv. 1—13.)

The same truth is also distinctly stated by St. Paul in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians. After speaking of the *events* that shall take place at our Lord's second coming, he says, "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you; for yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in

the night." Nothing can be more general than this statement; and, in fact, a declaration that the day of the Lord was to come as a thief upon the ungodly only, would have afforded no reason why the apostle should not have communicated some instruction to the Thessalonian saints respecting the times and seasons. But it is sometimes urged, that in a subsequent verse the apostle adds, "Ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief;" and hence, that the statement in the former verse can apply only to the ungodly. There is nothing, however, in this language to support such a conclusion, and much in the context against it. For it is a totally different thing to say, that that day should not *come* upon the godly as a thief, and that it should not *overtake* (καταλαβη) them, or *take hold* of them, as a thief. The word is put in contrast with that used respecting the ungodly in the preceding verse, that when that day came upon *them*, *they* "should not *escape*;" to which it is added, that the godly should not be thus "*overtaken*, or *taken hold of*." And the *reason* given by the apostle for this, namely, because they were not "in darkness," clearly proves the meaning of the words; for the darkness here spoken of is the darkness of *sin*, as verses 6, 8, fully prove; and hence, their not being thus overtaken, depends upon their *state*, and not upon *their knowing when the day is to come*. He, therefore, adds an exhortation to them to be "sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love," &c. In fact, the same metaphor is used by our Lord himself, and his language manifestly applies as much to his own servants as to the ungodly. "This know," he says, "that if the good man of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. Be ye therefore ready also; for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think *not*." (Luke xii. 39, 40.) The master of the house had his house broken through because, *not being always on the watch*, the thief coming unexpectedly had found him sleeping. Hence if his followers would avoid a similar re-

sult, they must be "*always ready*," that they may not be taken unprepared by him, for his coming would be as unexpected and sudden as that of the thief was to the man whose house was broken through, but would not be attended with similar consequences if they were *always* ready.

It is also repeated by St. Peter in terms quite general, "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night;" and the only preparation to which he exhorts Christians is, to live "in all holy conversation and godliness," &c. while they look forward to that day, &c. (2 Pet. iii. 10, 11, 14.) In all these cases, indeed, the only preparation to which Christians are exhorted is that of watchfulness, diligence, and holiness, that *whenever* their Lord comes they may be prepared to meet him; and this on the very ground that he will come when he is *not* expected. By this watchfulness is meant not the restlessness of those who amuse themselves with speculations as to the time of his coming, for he has assigned other employment to his servants, (Mark xiii. 34,) but the being always in that state of preparation, that when he cometh and knocketh they may open unto him immediately. (Luke xii. 36.) And (to preserve the metaphor) it does appear to the writer, that the servant who is engaged in preparing himself and the house for the reception of his Lord, is as likely to be *ready* for that event, as he who is standing at the window to see him coming, especially when we recollect how many false alarms have been given by such self-commissioned watchmen.

If, then, this day is to be so sudden and unexpected, so that when the first notice of it comes, the time for preparation is past, how is this to be reconciled with the appearance of prophets, and the bestowal of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit to usher in that day?

This alone, to mention no other difficulty, puts a bar to the expectation of a revival of those gifts under the present dispensation, which it will be difficult to remove.

Why, moreover, should we entertain so anxious a desire for the prophetic gift, and the power of working miracles?

The Editor of "The General Delusion," indeed, imputes it to the conceit and pride of the Christian Church, that she does not anxiously desire and pray for those gifts. But when we find that such men as Chrysostom and Augustine, Luther and Melancthon, and almost all the great and spiritually minded of her members for the last fifteen centuries, have not only not indulged such desires and prayers, but disapproved of them, and warned us that we are not to expect those gifts now, is it not something worse than presumption to oppose our own private notions, or the crude dicta of a few comparatively obscure individuals, to the general testimony of the Christian Church? *We find no instances of such prayers even in Scripture, when these gifts were evidently possessed by many in the Church. The revelations made to the prophets were manifestly not thus sought for by them.* (See Jer. i. 6; Dan. ix. 2, x. 12.) It was left by them to the good pleasure of God to bestow them as he thought fit. Let me earnestly commend this fact to the consideration of the reader.

To me, indeed, it appears, that a very earnest desire after the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, as if they were the great objects of the Christian's ambition, (if I may use the term,) shows, of itself, a want of genuine spirituality of mind; which is invariably characterized by the exercise, and a desire for an increase, of—not the extraordinary gifts, but—the sanctifying graces, of the Spirit. It lays a man open to not a little suspicion as to the real nature of his motives, that he should so anxiously desire to be gifted with extraordinary *power*.

The one great object of desire to the spiritual mind is sanctification, the progressive renewal of the soul by the internal operations of the Holy Spirit upon it as an illuminating, purifying, strengthening, and comforting Spirit, taking of the things of Christ, and revealing them to the mind, enabling it to realize the great truths of the divine word, and to live by faith upon them. And the *evidence* of such a work, and its *effects*, will be a quiet unostentatious walking with God in the fulfilment of Christian duties, the

exhibition of Christian tempers, and a generally humble, holy, and consistent course of conduct. But, if, instead of making this work of sanctification and renewal after the image of God, the *one great* object of desire and pursuit, a man is restless for the possession of supernatural powers, as if these were the great and general effects to be produced by the indwelling of the Spirit in the soul, he betrays at once that want of real spiritual feeling that he would fain charge upon others, and an ignorance of the real object of Christ's work, which was not to enable men to speak various languages and work cures upon their fellow-creatures, or that they might become the passive organs of the Spirit's utterance, but that they might become "a peculiar people, zealous of good works," that they might "adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour in all things," that "denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, they should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world."

But, say the advocates for these claims, the people of God have the Spirit dwelling in them. True indeed; and blessed be God for such a precious gift; but what are the scriptural evidences of a man's having that gift? Are they that he can work miracles, or that his mouth is painfully constrained to pour out words of religious instruction? No; "the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." (Gal. v. 22, 23.) And so the great promise of the New Covenant is, "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts . . . . and all shall know me," &c. (Jer. xxxi. 33, 34; Heb. viii. 10, 11.) But now we are told that the Church is ignorant and defective in spirituality, to be *satisfied* with seeking the attainment of these blessings, for that she ought not to rest contented with any thing short of being able to speak foreign languages, to cure diseases, to utter predictions, to exercise, in fact, the prerogatives of God himself. And these extraordinary endowments are set forth as the standard by which we are to measure Christian attainments. How different this from the language which our Lord uses

respecting them. When the disciples returned to him pleased with the supernatural power which he had enabled them to exercise, he says, "In this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject to you, but rather rejoice that your names are written in heaven." (Luke x. 20.)

The passage so often quoted by those whose case we are now considering, where the apostle says, "Covet earnestly the best gifts," affords any thing but a confirmation of the view they propose to establish by it. The extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were *then* abundant in the Church; and those less edifying, but probably considered more showy, were sometimes preferred to those which were more useful. (1 Cor. xiv.) In this state of things, then, the apostle exhorts them to covet earnestly the BEST gifts; and then, to show them still further how inferior *all* those gifts were to real sanctification of heart and holiness of life, and that, in fact, *considered in themselves, and alone*, they were worth *nothing*, he immediately adds, "And yet show I unto you *a more excellent way*. Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass . . . And though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries and all knowledge . . . . and have not charity, I am *nothing* . . . . Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." (1 Cor. xii. 31; xiii. 1, 2, 8.)

It is true, indeed, that these gifts were at that time legitimate objects of desire to Christians, for the apostle exhorts them, "Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts." (1 Cor. xiv. 1.) They were so not only from their being so essential at that time as witnesses to the gospel dispensation upon its introduction, but also as the usual accompaniments *then* of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the heart. But the case is altogether different at the present day, especially in a Christian country, and when, for fifteen centuries at least, these gifts have *confessedly* not been the *usual* accompaniments of the reception of the influences of the Holy Spirit in the heart.

These gifts may exalt a man in the eyes of his fellow-creatures, and also may make him an instrument, *when God sees fit so to use him*, for exhibiting the divine power; but they have no tendency to improve the man himself, no power to build him up in holiness and purify his heart. The sanctifying gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit work a transforming effect upon the soul, new-creating it after the image of God in righteousness and true holiness, bringing it continually nearer to the divine model. These have no such effect. Nay, on the contrary, we have St. Paul's own testimony, that the possession of such gifts, instead of having an influence in promoting holiness, is of so contrary a tendency, that he himself needed a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet him, lest he should be exalted above measure at the revelations which had been vouchsafed him.

Can the possession of such gifts, then, be an object of genuine spiritual desire to a renewed mind? That, when bestowed, it should be used to the glory of the Giver, with thankfulness and gratitude for the honour conferred, is another matter; but that it should be the object of earnest desire and prayer, betrays either an ignorance of its real tendency or the secret lurkings of spiritual pride. The example of David formed no just ground of expectation to every Israelitish youth, of being able to wield a Goliath's sword. It is, in fact, like a child asking a parent for an edged tool which it is mercy to withhold; and if it obstinately make one for itself, it *may* be allowed, by the kindest parent, to reap the natural consequences, that it may be taught that from suffering, which it refused to learn otherwise. And this, be it remembered, is the *usual recorded* mode of God's dealings with his children.

Of a claim at the present day to the possession of such gifts, it is said by Dr. More, in his Mystery of Godliness, that it "is never disjoined from the highest kind of pride, even where it seems to be most humble. For the attributing nothing to itself, but that all its knowledge and power are immediately from God, is nothing else but an ostenta-

tion of a higher kind of power and more infallible way of knowledge than other mortals have." [3]

Whatever may be the influence which excitement or natural enthusiasm may have in producing such scenes as those to which we are now alluding, it is but too evident that there is another and a more powerful agent, more or less concerned in the delusion. It may be asked, indeed, what interest Satan can have in exhorting men to holiness, in prophesying the downfall of his kingdom, &c. But in this very point lies the subtilty of the deception. Were he not to clothe himself as an angel of light, his devices would have no effect upon those whom alone it is his object to lead astray,—the children of God. Were he not also to make use of good men as his instruments, he would be equally unsuccessful. While, therefore, in order to keep up the delusion, he enables such persons to deliver, in an extraordinary manner, much that is true and good and useful, his own purposes are answered in various ways. He thus leads them unconsciously to the intermixture, if not of fundamentally false doctrine, (of which, however, the present case does not

[3] The claims and expectations of miraculous powers advanced by persons at various times, have, in almost all cases, been founded upon the fact of their having been bestowed upon the apostles and others in the primitive church, and the supposed absence of any proper cause for their discontinuance; but the error of Mr. Irving and his party in this matter is much more deeply seated. It, in fact, arises from their fundamental errors on the doctrine of the incarnation. It is the tenet of Mr. Irving, that "the baptism of the Holy Ghost doth bring to every believer the presence of the Father, and the power of the Holy Ghost, according to that measure at the least in which Christ, during the days of his flesh, possessed the same." (Irving's Day of Pentecost, p. 39.) They "straightway argue," as Mr. Irving says, (see p. 14 above,) "if Jesus as a man in my nature thus spoke and thus performed mighty works by the Holy Ghost which he even promiseth to me, then ought I, in the same nature, by the same Spirit, to do likewise the works which he did, and greater works than these;" so that instead of the Holy Spirit dividing to every man severally as he will, (1 Cor. xii. 11, Eph. iv. 7, 16, Rom. xii. 3, 6,) there is that unlimited possession of that Spirit by the believer, that invests him with all his powers, even as they were possessed by Christ himself;—a fancy founded upon fundamental errors and fraught with mischief. It, in fact, rests upon the supposition that Christ was a mere man, supported in a peculiar way by the Holy Spirit. But on these points see the Appendix.

admit the exception,) yet at least of unprofitable speculations, false predictions, and notions that encourage unwarrantable expectations. This intermixture is not in the present claimants denied,[4] and it is one of the extraordinary features of the case, (though one which it shares in common with the French and English prophets of the last century,) that this, which is so constantly pointed out by the early Fathers of the Church as one great proof of a satanic possession, is, as they conceive, to be accounted for, by supposing that persons may be, during one and the same utterance, at one moment actuated by the Holy Spirit, and at another, either by their own imagination, or by an evil spirit.[5]

By this method, also, he leads them to entertain presumptuous thoughts of their being endowed by God with his extraordinary gifts; and if these gifts are themselves calculated to engender pride, how much more injurious must a false notion of their possession be to the spirit of the claimant!

Nor do the evil effects of such a delusion terminate with the individual actors in it. One of the first effects is, the creation of fresh divisions in the Church—that great object of its subtile enemy. So far, also, as the delusion spreads, the minds of men are led to unwarrantable expectations, which, when disappointed, *cause their faith and hope to flag, produce, not unfrequently, hard thoughts of God, and often create a reaction in the mind against religion itself.* Men will not always remember that the fault is with

[4] See Baxter's Narrative, pp. 119, 120.

[5] Not to notice here the awful assertion, that the Spirit of God can be found so in connexion with an evil spirit, as to prompt part of a discourse of which the remainder proceeds from Satan, we have in the allowance, that part of these utterances may proceed from the imagination of the speaker, an unanswerable argument to prove that "the power" may be nothing more than the power of nature. For if part of that which is spoken apparently under the influence of "the power," be supposed to proceed from the imagination of the speaker, then is there nothing in the manifestation of this "power" but what may be done by the strength of nature. The form of utterance remaining the same while the man is delivering his own imaginations as it was while he was supposed to speak by the Spirit, there is not a shadow of a proof in the *mode* of utterance that such an utterance is supernatural.

themselves for indulging notions formed upon insufficient grounds, and that they have been wearying themselves with very vanity. Nay, many, moved by the appearances of sincerity and piety they have witnessed in such claimants, and *losing sight of the self-opiniativeness that carried them away in opposition to the warnings and remonstrances of the whole Christian Church*, have their very faith in Christianity itself shaken by the discovery that such persons have been under a delusion. And as it respects the world, there is nothing, perhaps, that can more prejudice them against religion, or induce them to identify all earnestness and zeal in the ways of God with the weakness and enthusiasm of the fanatic, as such a caricature of the Christian character as the conduct of such persons exhibits to them.

"It has ever been," says Milner, *speaking of the Montanists*, "one of the greatest trials to men really led by the Spirit of God—besides the open opposition of the profane—to be obliged to encounter the subtile devices of Satan, who often raises up pretended illuminations, and so connects them with delusion, folly, wickedness, and self-conceit, that they expose true godliness to the imputation of enthusiasm, and to contempt and disgrace . . . Whatever high pretensions the eruptions of fanaticism make to the influences of the Divine Spirit, they are ever unfavourable to them in reality; not only by their unholy tendency during the paroxysm of zeal, but much more so by the effects of contemptuous profaneness and incredulous scepticism which they leave behind them. It is for the sake of these chiefly that Satan seems to invent and support such delusions."[6]

The evil influence, indeed, of such things upon real religion, is not a late discovery. Thus writes Mr. Spencer in his tract already cited, written nearly two centuries ago. Speaking of those who follow such things, he says:—"Their great question is, *Watchman, What of the night?* What news of things as yet in the dark and out of view? . . . : . The great sign with them of a familiar acquaintance with God is, when he is continually whispering news

[6] Milner's History of the Church of Christ, vol. i.

in men's ears, and making them intimate to his secrets; *and no man shall be thought a* SPIRITUAL *preacher* by them, but he that can loose the seals of the Apocalyptic visions. In the interim, by such fond thoughts and curiosities the minds of men are made vain and trifling, their spirits too subtil and airy to fix upon a serious thing, and while their eyes are thus at the ends of the earth, they neglect to heed their way. . . . . The Church of Rome proves herself the temple of the living God, and God's presence with her, by the voice of his oracles heard therein. She hath, she tells us, the spirit of prophecy, (called the testimony of Jesus,) to bear witness to her doctrine, discipline, and worship; and to this purpose gives us in a list of her prophets, (*but most of them women*,) and of their wonderful predictions, and challenges us to instance any such parallel examples. To whom we return, *we are not careful to answer thee in this matter.* (Dan. iii. 16.) *While the house of God with us is built upon the foundation of the true prophets and apostles, it will not need daubing with any such untempered mortar as vulgar prophecies are, to give strength or beauty thereunto.* But religion is a far greater sufferer by such spurious visions and prophecies in the foundation thereof, that sure word of prophecy upon which it bottoms. There can hardly be a more subtil way invented to sink the value and credit of all divine prophecies and illapses than the multitude of those tinsel enthusiasms which are in the world. Men will quickly grow coy, and loth to trust themselves with a revelation, when they see so much imposture breaking in upon the world that usurps that name. . . . . [And if circumstances should] make them impregnable by a temptation to any such subtil atheism, yet still Scripture is disparaged, while the affections of men are divided between an old prophecy and a new, and that sickly humour in some men of longing after somewhat new in religion is fed, men's gadding fancies are gratified, and religion is exposed to the danger of being evaporated into air and rapture . . . . They that deliver these pretended

prophecies presume it were not to believe, but to dispute, if they should (like Gideon, Judges vi. 17) desire a sign of God, that it is he indeed that talketh with them; *these impressions they conceive are both writing and seal to themselves, and proclaim by their own mighty force and vivacity, that they are set on by a divine hand; the mind of man, (say they,) under the divine visitations, is only* τα θεια πασχειν, *to attend in an humble passiveness and silence to God, while instructing it by the whispers of his Spirit;* a doctrine which is virtually an infinite imposture . . . And as much do these prophecies usurp upon the understandings of those to whom they are tendered; we must trust our faith with these things, but never offer to demand first the security of some divine sign; we must believe them of divine inspiration only because we are told they are so; and if we demur, as thinking the condition unreasonable, we are *bidden to have a care we be not found to fight against God*, and so must become fools for fear we prove knaves . . . . Our blessed Saviour himself would not so far control the law of reasonable nature in man, as to require him to a faith of *his* prophecies before assurance given of their divinity . . . . . These prophecies are of very evil consequence in common life; they give silly men to conceit they are never God's favourites till they are half mad, and have constant intelligence from heaven by some new vision . . . They keep men from possessing themselves in peace by a secure repose on the wisdom and goodness of God. They tempt them to a neglect of those faithful and acknowledged rules of life, Scripture, and the maxims of reason, to attend to measures fantastical and never proved," &c. And then, as an illustration of the sort of cases to which he was referring, he quotes, among others, that, already described at length, of Kotter, Poniatowsky and Drabicius, whose great supporter, Comenius, he calls "a person whose other works praise him so that I need say nothing."[7]

If, then, there be any truth in these observations, if there

[7] Spencer's Vanity of Vulgar Prophecies, pp. 13—21.

be but a portion of these evil consequences likely to flow from such pretended revelations, we have an abundant answer to the question, how they can promote the designs of Satan.

The admonitions left on record by our Lord lead us to the conclusion, that such are peculiarly the trials which his people are to expect in the latter times of the Christian dispensation. Gifted as they are with the oracles of God, given under the present and the preceding dispensations, as well as the recorded experience of the Church for so long a period, it may appear fit to the wisdom and goodness of God, that their faith should be subjected to a test more than ordinarily severe and searching. The malice of Satan, knowing that his time is short, may be about to be displayed with even yet more crafty ingenuity than former ages have witnessed. It is surely a time, then, when, more than ever, we should stand by the acknowledged word of God as our *alone* guide and rule, and hold ourselves aloof from any pretended new revelation, in which we are so likely to be deceived. The latter bears upon the face of it pretensions against which our Lord has especially warned us. The former is, as God himself has assured us, able to make us wise unto salvation, and furnish us for our Christian course *so as to leave nothing wanting.* (2 Tim. iii. 15—17.) Relying on the latter, we are building on a foundation of which comparatively we know nothing; resting *wholly* on the former, we are building on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX

ON THE HERESY WITH WHICH THE CLAIMS ARE CONNECTED.

In publishing a second edition of the preceding work, it has appeared on many accounts desirable to add here a few observations on the Heresy with which the claims, just considered, are connected. I have reserved them for this place in order to keep them distinct from the discussion of the claims themselves; for though the two are united in the persons of the present claimants, they are quite independent of each other, and may fall and be revived quite independently of each other. The remarks I am about to make are rather intended as *a caution* to those whom curiosity might lead to the scene of those delusions, than as a regular polemical refutation of the erroneous doctrines there promulgated, which I cannot but hope to be unnecessary. It will, I am convinced, be quite sufficient for the satisfaction of most, merely to lift the veil which an impetuous eloquence and mysterious phraseology have thrown over those errors, and exhibit them in their native deformity.

There is much mistake and misapprehension on this matter even among those who have been frequent attendants on the ministrations of the party. Nothing can be a better proof of this than the case of Mr. Baxter already noticed, who actually joined the party, and remained a member of it for some time, without being conscious of the real nature of the doctrines he was supporting; led away, no doubt, by

the use they make of words that seem to imply orthodox sentiments, under the cover of which are introduced heresies of the most fearful and dangerous kind.

That curiosity should exist, and be indulged, to hear those who profess to speak by an immediate impulse of the Holy Spirit of God, *and are not involved in doctrinal errors*, is neither surprising nor reprehensible,—nay, rather is it a duty to inquire at the least into the matter;—but *that our curiosity to hear such claimants should be indulged when we know that the doctrines supported by them are contrary to God's written word, and awfully erroneous, is an act that may justly draw down upon us God's righteous judgment.* I confess that when this fact is so palpable, so clearly proved, as in the case before us, where there has been the most open and distinct avowal of such doctrines, and where the principal adherent of the party has *for those doctrines been deposed by the solemn and deliberate decision of the venerable church to which he belonged*, I can conceive of no possible excuse, or even palliative, for allowing ourselves, in the face of those facts, and the knowledge that others have fallen under the excitement, and been with difficulty recovered from the state of delusion into which they were permitted to fall, to go into the midst of such scenes. *That such should be suffered to be deluded can be regarded by no one as extraordinary.*

It is easy to understand why the argument should be so strongly pressed, that we cannot judge of the manifestations without having witnessed them; viz. that the senses may be bewildered, and the judgment overpowered by them. But *the very first and far most important test* of them is one which may be, *and ought to be*, determined before we give them the smallest countenance, viz. whether their doctrines are agreeable to the *known word of God.* If they are not, then I say with the apostle, "Though we, or *an angel from heaven*, preach any other gospel unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. i. 8.)

But there are many, and some I believe even of those who openly countenance the present claimants, who have

not any distinct and proper idea of the real doctrines of the party.

I will endeavour, then, in this place, in as brief and summary a way as possible, to state from authentic sources, and compare with Scripture, their real sentiments, together with the acknowledged consequences of those opinions affecting the great fundamental truths of the gospel.

Their primary error, and the source of all the others, is, the doctrine they maintain respecting our Lord's human nature. What this is, I shall state in Mr. Irving's own words; and to remove all possibility of mistake, I shall select those passages from Mr. Irving's writings which were made the ground of his deposition in the Church of Scotland, and were at the time of his trial in March 1833, solemnly confirmed by him as containing his sentiments. The Treatises from which these passages are taken, are "The Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of our Lord's Human Nature;" "The day of Pentecost, or the Baptism with the Holy Ghost;" and a paper in the Morning Watch for March 1832, entitled, "A Judgment as to what course the Ministers and People of Scotland should take in consequence of the Decisions of the last General Assembly."

In the Treatise called "The Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of our Lord's Human Nature," he says,—"All this effect of uniting Jew and Gentile unto God, and unto one another, which is ascribed to Christ's body, to the sacrifice of his body without spot upon the cross, is derived from this very truth, that he took sinful flesh, or fallen human nature, and upheld it holy against the devil, the world, and the flesh, and the influence of all these upon the mind." (p. 8.) "If then Christ was made under the law, he must have been made by his human nature, liable to, yea, and inclined to, all those things which the law interdicted." (p. 10.) "Conceive every variety of human passion, every variety of human affection, every variety of human error, every variety of human wickedness, which hath ever been realized, inherent in the humanity, and combined against the holiness, of him who was not only a man, but the Son

of man, the heir of all the infirmities which man entaileth upon his children." (p. 17.) "If his human nature differed, by however little, from ours, in its alienation and guiltiness, then the work of reducing it into eternal harmony with God hath no bearing whatever upon our nature, with which it is not the same." (p. 88.) "Was he conscious, then, to the motions of the flesh and of the fleshly mind? In so far as any regenerate man, when under the operation of the Holy Ghost, is conscious of them . . . . I hold it to be the surrender of the whole question to say, that he was not conscious of, engaged with and troubled by, every evil disposition which inhereth in the fallen manhood, which overpowereth every man that is not born of God; which overpowered not Christ, only because he was born or generated of God." (p. 111.) "Manhood after the fall broke out into sins of every name and aggravation, corrupt to the very heart's core, and from the centre of its inmost will sending out streams black as hell. This is the human nature which every man is clothed upon withal, which the Son of man was clothed upon withal, bristling thick and strong with sin like the hairs upon the porcupine . . . . . I stand forth and say, that the teeming fountain of the heart's vileness was opened on him; and the Augean stable of human wickedness was given him to cleanse, and the furious wild beasts of human passions were appointed him to tame. This, this is the horrible pit and the miry clay out of which he was brought," &c. (p. 126.) "I believe it to be most orthodox, and of the substance and essence of the orthodox faith, to hold that Christ could say, until his resurrection, 'Not I, but sin that tempteth me in my flesh,' just as after the resurrection he could say, 'I am separate from sinners.' And, moreover, I believe that the only difference between his body of humiliation and his body of resurrection is in this very thing, that sin inhered in the human nature, making it mortal and corruptible till that very time that he rose from the dead." (p. 127.) In his Treatise on the Day of Pentecost he says, —"The baptism of the Holy Ghost doth bring to every be-

liever the presence of the Father and the power of the Holy Ghost, according to that measure, at the least, in which Christ, during the days of his flesh, possessed the same." (p. 39.) And in his "Judgment on the Decisions of the General Assembly," he says,—"Now because there is no other work of the Son in flesh but this, that he took our nature in its fallen, mortal, and corruptible state, and redeemed it into the immortal, incorruptible, and glorious state in which it is in the heavens, the General Assembly have, with one voice, made void Christ's name as the Son of man, and denied his coming in flesh, and his work therein." (p. 39.) "The duty which the Christian people owe to those ministers, who in the General Assembly did give their condemnation of this doctrine by which we hold the Head, is, in their several parishes, to go boldly in, and ask them to their face, if they believe that Christ came in flesh, and had the law of the flesh, and the temptations of flesh to struggle with and overcome; and if they confess not to this doctrine, to denounce them as denying the Lord that bought them, as wolves in sheeps' clothing," &c. (p. 96.)

These are the principal passages upon which the sentence of deposition against Mr. Irving was founded, and it would be easy to add many others similar to them from other parts of his writings. The treatise on the human nature of Christ is full of such passages. He there says that Christ took manhood in its natural "state of resistance to and alienation from God, of condemnation and proclivity to evil, of subjection to the devil;" (p. 2, 3;) that "there was a will in him contrary to the will of the Father," (p. 22;) that there were "in Christ's nature appetites and ambitions and spiritual darkenings," (p. 24;) that "his will was lying under our bondage," which "bondage is the oppression of the devil, the world, and the flesh;" and that his work "is no work of redemption, if the will he took was not a will in bondage;" (p. 89,) and it is an "heretical doctrine, that Christ's generation was something more than *the implantation of that Holy-Ghost life in the members of his human nature which is implanted in us by regeneration*," (p. 140;)

and what he means by "the flesh" is, "not the body alone, nor the reasonable soul alone, but the body and the soul or spirit, the visible and the invisible parts of man, subsisting in union with one another." (page 146.)

And so in his letters to Mr. Baxter he says, that there was in Christ's flesh "a proclivity to the world and Satan," and that "the law of the flesh was there all present." (Baxter's Narrative, p. 107.)[1]

These are strong expressions—expressions that, applied to our Lord, make one shudder with horror; but not a whit too strong as a description of that sinful human nature which it is asserted he took. And, therefore, he who rejects these expressions, must reject the doctrine from which they flow. Mr. Irving has only given that nature its right description; "*The heart* is deceitful above all things, and *desperately wicked;*" which refers not to the acts of sin, but to *the nature of that heart* from which they come. If, therefore, our Lord had just our nature, "flesh and heart," (as Mr. Irving says,) these words apply to him as much as to us. Let us, however, at once divest this doctrine of all the figures, hyperboles, and strong expressions, which some who think him right in the main are afraid of using, and consider the simple naked doctrine itself, stated in the mildest terms. It is clear that this is, that there was in the human nature of Christ that tendency or pro-

[1] In the face of all this Mr. Irving has, in the very book from which most of these extracts are taken, attempted to exculpate himself from the charge of Bourignonism, and he does it in this way. The ground of the charge is, that the seventh article for which Mad. Bourignon was condemned by the Church of Scotland was this: "the assertion of the sinful corruption of Christ's human nature, and a rebellion in Christ's natural will to the will of God." This doctrine was, of course, united with the idea, that notwithstanding this, Christ was not actually a sinner. Will it be believed, that, to get over the difficulty, Mr. Irving starts with the assumption that both the propositions of this condemned article refer "*to a moral act;*" and that "the object of condemning both propositions is, (if indeed they be two and not one,) to save Christ's human nature from the charge of *actual sin*. The propositions go not to the assertion of anything concerning the properties of that which Christ took, but concerning *the actings of it* when taken by him." (p. 69.)? It will easily be believed that, starting with this assumption, he has found no difficulty in making out his case.

clivity to sin which exists in all the natural descendants of Adam, or, in other words, the moral taint or corruption brought upon Adam and his posterity by the fall. The principal ground upon which this tenet is made to rest, is, that had Christ been free from this he could not have been said to have assumed our nature. However much individuals in the party may differ from one another in their modes of expression, this tenet is held by all of them. Mr. Campbell's expressions, when speaking of our Lord's human nature, are, "sinful flesh, flesh requiring to be overcome, having in Christ the same nature and *tendency* as in us, which had to be stamped with condemnation, on account of its condition of *enmity against God*, a foe difficult to contend with;"[2] Mr. Erskine's are, "the taint of the fall, the rebellious body, tendencies opposite to God's character," &c.;[3] and the Morning Watch teems with papers on this subject, upholding Mr. Irving's views.

Together with this doctrine, however, they agree in asserting as a *fundamental and essential truth*, that the human nature of Christ was, through the power of the Spirit and its union with the Second Person in the Trinity, kept free from all actual sin; from which they draw the conclusion that Christ himself was *perfectly holy*.

By professing, therefore, to hold the doctrine of Christ's *perfect holiness*, all the fears of those who do not see the contradiction that exists between the two tenets, are at once laid at rest.

The single point for our consideration, then, and the turning point of the whole controversy, is, whether Christ could be perfectly holy if he had a proclivity to sin in his flesh; in other words, whether a proclivity to sin is *in itself* sinful, so as *necessarily* to make the person in whom it exists *guilty* of sin.

The latter, of course, they are compelled to deny, otherwise, upon their notions, Christ could not be perfectly holy; and they say that this proclivity is not sinful

[2] See his "Sermons." [3] See his "Brazen Serpent," 2nd edition, &c.

so as to create *guilt*, unless it be indulged; and that the fact of an inclination to sin existing in a person does not *in itself* prevent his remaining perfectly holy.[4]

The reader, no doubt, will be at once disposed to ask, what is Mr. Irving's view of original sin? It is this,—that original sin means only our falling in Adam, that "it stands in our having been created otherwise than we now are born," and hence that it "cannot apply to Christ, who was not then created at all, but is himself the Creator." (Holiness in Flesh, pp. 3, 4.) It is most important to observe this definition, because it differs materially from that given in all the orthodox Protestant Confessions. But, to support his view of the human nature of our Lord, it was absolutely necessary for him to assert that the proclivity to sin found in our fallen nature was no part of original sin, but only, as it were, a misfortune flowing from it. Mr. Erskine boldly tells us, "My guilt does not lie in being a fallen creature; I was born so; and now if there were no favour upon me I could have no more guilt in being spiritually dead, than I should in being physically dead were I in a place destitute

[4] "I deny that it is unholiness to be tempted through the flesh, or by the flesh to be tempted *through the mind*, provided the will yield not to the evil suggestion, provided the will consent not to the evil consciousness."—Irving's Orth. and Cath. Doct. p. 153.

That such also is the view of the whole party the reader may see confirmed in a paper by Mr. Carlile, in the Morning Watch for March 1831, (No. ix. pp. 112—37.) "The child of God," he says, "who lives according to the commandments of his God, while he is beset with temptations from the world without and *his own evil passions* within, is in some respect holier than he who walks in the same course without the same temptations." (pp. 116, 117.) "I know not of one passage of scripture which charges guilt upon God's regenerate people for having to contend with their *sinful desires*, unless they be overcome by them. *So that I hold it undeniable*, that those who maintain that Christ had to war with the devil, the world, and *the flesh*, do not on that account impute sin to him." (p. 119.) "No sin is in the Scriptures imputed to the saints for having a law in their members warring against the law of their mind, so long as by the power of God's Spirit dwelling in them they resist its influence." (p. 123.) "*Guilt* is not charged upon God's people for inheriting those *sinful propensities*, unless they yield to their influence." (p. 136.) "There would have been no temptation, if these [i. e. "*evil*"] *passions* had not existed *in our Lord's human nature*." (p. 136.)

of vital air; my guilt, *like Adam's*, lies in wilfully shutting out life."[5]

After this, then, the reader will, no doubt, cease to wonder how, according to Mr. Irving's interpretation of the words, the human nature of Christ had a proclivity to sin, and so forth, and yet that Christ himself was perfectly free from original sin, and perfectly holy. In the sense attached to the words by the Protestant Christian Church, there is a complete contradiction between these two assertions; in Mr. Irving's, there may, perhaps, be none.[6] Between these definitions of the *term* "*original* sin," I leave the reader to

[5] It may be worth while to place before the reader the definition of original sin given by the Church of England. "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is *the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam*; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit, and therefore in every person born into this world *it deserveth God's wrath and damnation*. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek, *phronema sarkos*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the apostle doth confess, THAT CONCUPISCENCE AND LUST HATH OF ITSELF THE NATURE OF SIN." Art. 9.

[6] When Mr. Irving and his followers say, that Christ was "a holy God manifested in sinful humanity," "sinless in sinful flesh," (Mr. Irving's favourite phrase,) they mean, that though his human nature was sinful, *he* was not sinful, he had no guilt, because he never countenanced its evil propensities, but through the power of the Holy Spirit dwelling in him *from his birth*, uniformly resisted and overcame them; they would not deny that he *had* those evil propensities, for being in the flesh he took, it is undeniable that they were in *him*, and they do not mean to deny this when they deny that he was sinful, but they think that a person of whom a sinful nature forms an integral part may be perfectly sinless and holy by having within him a never-failing and omnipotent power to resist every evil propensity and disposition as soon as it rises, and strangle it as it were at its birth. Their view indeed is, that man himself is not a sinful being *on account of* his having a sinful nature, but only on these two grounds; first, that he fell in Adam, the guilt of which fall they consider to be the only guilt belonging *naturally* to his posterity, (limiting original sin to that sin of Adam;) and, secondly, that he does not uniformly resist and overcome the evil propensities of his nature.

It still remains, however, for Mr. Irving to explain how it is that if our blessed Lord inherited through his mother, both in body and soul, the fallen nature of Adam, he did not inherit the guilt of his sin in the same way as he

choose, as my concern is about things rather than words, and proceed at once to prove that the natural inclination to sin which exists in fallen man, does *of itself* make *him* a guilty sinful creature in the sight of God, and that when the inclination to do that which is forbidden rises, the person in whom that inclination exists commits sin, even if he has within himself a contrary principle by which he *immediately* resists and overcomes it.

The term commonly made use of by divines to express this inherent principle of corruption (if I may so call it) is *concupiscence;* comprehending under this name both the proneness of the fallen human nature to sin, and the evil inclination which *necessarily* springs from it. And they assert that each of these *of itself* subjects every *person* in whom it exists to the wrath of God as a sinner.

To come at once, then, to the testimony of Scripture upon this point, let us observe, first, that this natural concupiscence (or call it what you will) is there clearly said *to be sin.*

In the first place, the *primary and incipient motions* of this inherent corruption are *sin;* "I had not known *sin*," says the apostle, "but by the law; for I had not known *lust*, (επιθυμιαν) except the law had said, thou shalt not covet;" (Rom. vii. 7;) which is thus paraphrased by the excellent Guise; "I myself should not have understood some things to be *really sinful and condemnable*, nor been *suitably humbled* for them, and brought to see my need of Christ to save me from them, had it not been for the light and authority of God's holy law, which discovered and forbade them: for to instance only in one particular, I should

supposes us to do. In fact, to support his view of our Lord's human nature, he must fall back upon Pelagianism, and deny (as Mr. Erskine seems to do) that *any guilt* attaches itself to man considered merely as the descendant of Adam; and that men incur guilt only for what they themselves individually do. And this no doubt is the view which is most agreeable to the natural feelings and inclinations of all men; but, as Mr. Irving probably sees, totally opposed to Scripture, which teaches us that in Adam all died, and were by his disobedience made sinners. But if men are not *naturally guilty*, "by nature children of wrath," then preservation from actual sin would have been sufficient to have secured their acceptance with God, and consequently the sacrifice of Christ would have been unnecessary; and hence, they who hold this view, consistently enough speak of Christ only as our teacher and example.

never have apprehended and been convinced in my own conscience that the secret workings of irregular desires, and *the very first motions of inordinate affections*, were *sins*, unless the law had pronounced them to be so in the tenth commandment, saying, 'Thou shalt not covet.'" The error of Mr. Irving on this point, then, arises from the want of a knowledge of the law of God in its spirituality and extent, and his lowering the standard of holiness till it comes within the grasp of a fallen and corrupt being.—Moreover; the natural corruption which is the *source* of evil motions, is *sin*. "Sin," says the apostle, "taking occasion by the commandment, *wrought in me* all manner of concupiscence." That "*sin*" which *works concupiscence in a man* must be his natural inherent corruption. The appellation is repeated in the 11th verse: "Sin taking occasion by the commandment deceived me, and by it slew me." And in the 13th verse, this appellation is accompanied with words which one would suppose could scarcely leave a doubt on this subject in any mind open to conviction; "Sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good: that sin by the commandment might become EXCEEDING SINFUL." (καθ' ὑπερβολην ἁμαρτωλος)

The same term is manifestly applied to this inherent corruption in many other passages, as in Rom. vi. 12, where the apostle, speaking of the regenerate, says, "Let not sin *reign* in your mortal bodies that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof;" and Rom. vii. 17, "the sin that dwelleth in me." In this last passage it is clear that he speaks of merely natural and not indulged concupiscence, from his speaking in the context of its existing in the person contrary to his renewed will. Again; we are told in the book of Proverbs, that "the *thought* of foolishness is *sin*." (Prov. xxiv. 9.)

But further; not only is this natural concupiscence (or whatever name may be given to that which we have so called) sin, but *the person* in whom it exists is *on that account* a sinner, whether he indulges it or not.

The doctrine of Mr. Irving is a perfect self-contradiction boldly advanced by that spirit which is resolved never

to confess that the corruption which man derives from his forefather and with which he enters the world, is such sin as exposes him to the wrath of God. If, then, Scripture clearly declares that this inherent corruption is not a misfortune and evil merely, as Mr. Irving's party suppose, but does *of itself* render *the person* in whom it exists obnoxious to the wrath of God, the whole edifice of heresy erected by them falls to the ground. And here I would observe that had not Mr. Irving sheltered himself under the concession that we are guilty from having fallen in Adam, while he denies our guilt in having the corruption that was the consequence of the fall, and at once avowed (which with his view of the corrupt state of our Lord's human nature he must do, to be *consistent*) that any descendant of fallen Adam might obtain life by being enabled by the Spirit of God from his birth to obey the law of God, and resist the motions of the flesh, without any atonement being made for him, the testimonies that might have been brought from Scripture would have been still more numerous, because the Scripture writers do not in general separate the guilt of original corruption in man from the guilt of his having actually fallen in Adam. In other words, the guilt derived to the descendants of Adam is (as the Confessions of the reformed Churches all bear witness) the guilt of the first sin and *also* of the inherent corruption which was the consequence of it. But in this lies very much the subtilty of the heresy in its making inconsistent and self-contradictory assertions, and thus, as it is said, throwing dust into the eyes, and involving the matter in obscurity and confusion. But for the satisfaction of any who do not clearly see this, I will for a moment suppose that there is no inconsistency in it, and that though a man is guilty as having fallen in Adam, yet that it remains to be proved that the natural corruption inherent in him does of itself make him a sinner. I ask then, what can more clearly prove this than the words of our Lord when he was describing this natural corruption and concupiscence? Did *he* suppose that a man was not made a sinner by it? "From within, *out of the heart of men* proceed evil thoughts, &c.

&c. All these evil things come *from within* and DEFILE THE MAN." (Mark vii. 21—23.) Mr. Irving and his followers, on the contrary, say that they do not defile a man without he indulges them; that they may rise out of his heart, and *he himself* remain perfectly holy if he resists them. But does our Lord add any such limitation?

Again; St. Paul says, that "the carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be," and that "*to be carnally-minded* is *death*," and that the deliverance of the believer is due only to Christ having redeemed him from the curse of the law, by having been made a curse for him; (Rom. viii 6, 7; Gal. iii. 13;) for that otherwise he would be in a state of spiritual death, leading to eternal death. Mr. Irving, however, says that the carnal mind does not of itself make a person a sinner, but only if it is indulged. How different the language of the apostle! The carnal mind, he tells us, does *of itself* bring death, so that they who have the carnal mind, and do not walk according to it, but resist it, and walk after the Spirit, yet are only free from condemnation as "in Christ Jesus," (ver. 1,) as interested in his vicarious sacrifice and propitiation.

It is difficult, indeed, to conceive how any one can seriously conclude that the existence of that which is sinful in a person, *however he came by it*, does not of itself constitute that person a transgressor; and can only be accounted for as arising either from the desire of upholding an hypothesis or from the natural disinclination of fallen man to acknowledge the *guilt* of his corrupt state. The clear testimony of Scripture that this inherent corruption, viewed both in the fountain and its streams, is sin, settles the question, for "every sin is a transgression of the law," (ἡ ἁμαρτια εστιν ἡ ανομια. 1 John iii. 4), and every transgression of the law subjects the transgressor to the penalty of death, for "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all," (James ii. 10); and if this applies to one external act of transgression, how much more must it apply to that *habitual proneness* to acts of

disobedience, that indwelling spirit of disobedience, that exists in fallen man. "The wages of sin," in whomsoever it exists, and however he came by it, "is death." (Rom. vi. 23.) It is this innate natural concupiscence which draws away and entices man to the acts of sin, (James i, 14); and is thus actively sinful in being instrumental to sin.

This *natural corruption*, moreover, was one of the reasons for which God determined, at the time of the deluge, to "destroy man whom he had created, from the face of the earth," because "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." (Gen. vi. 5.) This is manifestly mentioned as a sort of *climax* in his guilt, and is alluded to again after the flood, (Gen. viii. 21,) that not only his deeds were evil, but that his *natural imaginations* were evil. But, according to the doctrine we are now considering, so far was this from adding to his guilt, or being a ground for God to destroy him, that there was no guilt at all in it, unless he yielded to those evil imaginations, or at least indulged them in his heart, for men did not (say they) bring this corruption upon themselves, and therefore cannot be guilty or esteemed sinners on that account.

Far different from this was the feeling of David. When he confesses his sin to God, he does not rest in the acknowledgment of the guilt of the outward transgression, but traces it up to its source, and confesses the *guilt* of that *original corruption* from which it sprang. "Behold, I was shapen *in iniquity*, and *in sin* did my mother conceive me. Behold, thou requirest truth in the inward parts," (Ps. li. 5, 6); and hence his cry is for *a clean heart*. "Create in me a clean heart, O God!" (ver. 10.) He had no idea of being perfectly holy, while his heart was defiled by natural concupiscence, however much it might be resisted.

As evil inclinations do not lose their character, so neither can they lose their guiltiness, by being resisted.

Moreover; let it be observed, that no desire or tendency can exist in the soul, which is not more or less *agreeable* to some faculty, quality, or disposition, of the person in whom it exists. There may be a contrary and

superior power co-existing in the soul, capable of stifling it at once; but there must be a momentary practical concurrence of some one of the affections in the conception of the sinful desire, and therefore the commission of sin. In an enlightened soul, also, the affections ought to be so completely under the control of the enlightened mind, that the desires ought to *take their rise* from its decisions, and hence the desire that precedes such decisions, and has to be resisted from its contrariety to the will of God, must bring guilt more or less upon the person in whom it rises.

The absurdity of this doctrine is manifest; for it supposes the existence of sin for which no one is guilty. The inherent corruption of fallen human nature was not an arbitrary punishment sent by God to punish man for the fall, but it was the consequence of the fall, and would of itself, if man could have brought it upon himself, without any act of disobedience, have rendered him guilty in the sight of God; so that after the fall man was not only guilty for the original act of disobedience, but from his inherent corruption. Could we suppose the original act of disobedience fully atoned for, but not the corruption that was its consequence, this corruption of nature (so clearly described as *sin* in Scripture) even if it were perfectly resisted in all men, would also require punishment from a holy God. This natural corruption is the offspring of sin, and therefore cannot but be sin; sin labouring under all the defilement and guilt which can ever belong to it.

Nothing can more fully show the spirituality and extent of the divine law, and confirm the view we have been taking of the light in which the natural corruption of the fallen human nature is viewed by God, than the fact that by the Mosaic law an atonement was required for *sins of ignorance*, and even INVOLUNTARY *acts of the flesh*, sins with which the will of the individual could have nothing to do; agreeably to which our Lord declares, That the servant that knew not his Lord's will and did it not, is to be beaten with few stripes. (Numb. xv. 27; &c. Luke xii. 48. See also Gen. xii. 17; xx. 17. 1 Tim. i. 13.)

To these scriptural testimonies as to the light in which this natural corruption is to be regarded, it seems hardly necessary to add any mere human authorities. As it respects Mr. Irving, indeed, who has so self-complacently blotted out of the history of the church the last "fifteen hundred years and more," as a period in which the truth has been so utterly obscured, that the Holy Spirit has had "nothing to seal to," and the church has been "keeping herself in misery and the world in darkness,"[6] it would be of little use to mention the sentiments of the most eminent divines the church has produced. But as there may be others who are not quite prepared as yet to take this ground, I will just add, that the doctrine here maintained is the doctrine both of the primitive church, and of all the reformed churches, in whose confessions, written after it had been impugned by the Romanists, it is enforced as one of the most important articles of faith.

For the sentiments of the early Fathers, I will refer only to one passage of Augustine, where, *speaking on this very point*, he says, that "that concupiscence of the flesh AGAINST WHICH THE GOOD SPIRIT LUSTETH, [words cannot be more distinct to describe what he means,] is,"—not only "the punishment of sin," and "the cause of sin," but also,—"sin, because there is in it disobedience against the sovereignty of the mind," *i. e.* of course the *renewed* mind.[7]

The Romanists having been driven, in order to support their views of human merit, the perfectibility of the baptized and works of supererogation, to the adoption of erroneous views upon this subject, viz. that this natural concupiscence is not sin *in the baptized*, the Confessions of the Reformed Churches,—the products of the united

[6] See p. 273 above.

[7] "Sicut cæcitas cordis, quam solus removet illuminator Deus, et peccatum est, quo in Deum non creditur; et pæna peccati, qua cor superbum digna animadversione punitur; et causa peccati, cùm mali aliquid cæci cordis errore committitur: ita *concupiscentia carnis, adversus quam bonus concupiscit spiritus*, et *peccatum est*, quia inest illi inobedientia contra dominatum mentis; et pæna peccati est, quia reddita est meritis inobedientis; et causa peccati est, defectione consentientis vel contagione nascentis."—Aug. Contra Julian. Pelag. lib. 5. § 8. Op. Ed. Bened. tom. x. col. 631.

wisdom of those noble confessors for God's truth, whose names have never till this day been alluded to in the Protestant church without the tribute of deep and heartfelt veneration,—bear their strongest testimony against so dangerous an error. The doctrine of the English church has been already given in her article, quoted above, p. 301.

So the French Confession says, "We believe that the whole race of Adam is infected with this contagion, which we call original sin, that is, a taint communicated by propagation . . . . We believe that this taint *is truly sin,* because it makes all and every man, not even those little ones excepted that lie hid in their mothers' womb, *guilty of eternal death in the sight of God.* We affirm also, that this taint, even after baptism, *is truly sin,* as far as relates to the fault of it, although they who are the children of God will not on that account be condemned, because God of his gratuitous goodness and mercy does not impute it to them. We say also, that this perverseness of nature is always bringing forth some fruits of malice and rebellion, so that even they who have attained a high degree of holiness, although they resist it, yet are defiled by many infirmities and offences as long as they live in this world. Psalm li. 7. Rom. iii. 9; v. 12; vii. 7, 18. 2 Cor. xii. 7."[8]

So the Belgic Confession;—"Original sin is the corruption of the whole nature, and an hereditary taint with which even the very infants in their mothers' womb are polluted; and which, as a noxious root, produces all kinds

[8] "Credimus totam Adami sobolem hac contagione infectam esse quam peccatum originale vocamus, vitium videlicet ex propagatione manans . . . Credimus hoc vitium esse verè peccatum, quod omnes et singulos homines, ne parvulis quidem exceptis adhuc in utero matrum delitescentibus, æternæ mortis reos coram Deo peragat. Affirmamus quoque hoc vitium, etiam post baptismum, esse vere peccatum, quod ad culpam attinet, quamvis qui filii Dei sunt, minime idcirco condemnentur, quoniam videlicet Deus, pro gratuita sua bonitate et misericordia, illud ipsis non imputat. Dicimus præterea hanc perversitatem semper edere fructus aliquos malitiæ et rebellionis, adeo ut etiam qui sanctitate excellunt, quamvis ei resistant, multis tamen infirmitatibus et delictis sint contaminati, quamdiu in hoc mundo versantur. Psalm. li. 7. Rom. iii. 9; v. 12; vii. 7, 18. 2 Corinth. xii. 7."—Confess. Gallic. Art. X. and XI. In Corp. et Syntagm. Confess., Ed. 1612.

of sins in man, *and is so filthy and abominable a thing in the sight of God, that it is sufficient for the condemnation of the whole human race.* Nor, indeed, are we to believe that it is altogether destroyed or plucked up by the roots by baptism, since *from it, as from a corrupt fountain, continual floods and streams are constantly rising up and pouring forth:* although to the children of God it does not tend, nor is imputed, to condemnation; but, *through the free grace and mercy of God,* is remitted to them."[9]

So the Confession of Augsburg, (or that of the Lutheran Church);—"We mean by original sin, that which the holy Fathers, and all orthodox men, and such as unite piety with learning, in the Church, so call; namely, that guilt by which all at their birth are, through the fall of Adam, subject to the wrath of God and eternal death, *and that corruption of the human nature derived from Adam.* And this corruption of the human nature comprehends both the defect of its original righteousness, or integrity, or obedience, and also concupiscence. . . . . *These defects and this concupiscence are a thing that is under condemnation, and in its own nature deserving of death. And this original taint is truly sin, bringing men under condemnation:* and moreover, at this present time, bringing eternal *death* upon those who are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit. They]*i. e.* "our churches"] condemn the Pelagians, who deny original sin, and think that those defects or that concupiscence are things indifferent, or punishments only, and are not from their own nature under condemnation," &c.[1]

[9] "Est autem peccatum originis corruptio totius naturæ, et vitium hæreditarium, quo et ipsi infantes in matris utero polluti sunt; quodque, velut noxia quædam radix, genus omne peccatorum in homine progerminat, estque tam turpe et execrabile coram Deo, ut ad universi generis humani condemnationem sufficiat. Neque vero per baptismum illud penitus extingui aut radicitus evelli credendum est, quandoquidem ex illo, tanquam ex corrupta scaturigine, perpetui fluctus atque rivuli assidue exoriuntur et effluunt: quamvis filiis Dei in condemnationem non cedat aut imputetur, sed ex pura Dei gratia et misericordia illis remittatur."—Confess. Belgic. Art. 15. In Corp. et Synt. Confess., Ed. 1612.

[1] "Intelligimus autem peccatum originis, quod sic vocant sancti patres,

So, lastly, the Confession of Saxony;—"Therefore original sin is, both on account of the fall of our first parents, *and also on account of that corruption which was the consequence of the fall*, to be at our birth *under the wrath of God, and deserving of eternal damnation*, unless there be a remission of our sins, for the sake of the Mediator . . . . *This whole corruption we affirm to be* SIN, and not simply the punishment of sin, and a thing indifferent. . . . Ambiguities are to be avoided in the church. Therefore we expressly call these evils *corruption*, which is often called by antient writers *evil concupiscence*. . . . *This evil concupiscence we affirm to be sin; and we assert that this whole doctrine concerning sin, as it is set forth and determined in our churches, is a doctrine which has had* THE PERPETUAL CONSENT OF THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD."[2]

The result, then, is, either that our blessed Lord was a sinner, or that Mr. Irving's assertions respecting his human nature are wholly false and groundless, and his first principle in theology, of a person being sinless in sinful flesh,[3] a complete absurdity.

et omnes orthodoxi et pie eruditi in Ecclesia, videlicet reatum, quo nascentes, propter Adæ lapsum, rei sunt iræ Dei et mortis æternæ, et ipsam corruptionem humanæ naturæ propagatam ab Adam. Et hæc naturæ humanæ corruptio defectus justitiæ seu integritatis seu obedientiæ originalis et concupiscentiam complectitur . . . . Defectus illi et concupiscentia sunt res damnata et sua natura digna morte. Estque vitium originis vere peccatum, damnans, et afferens nunc quoque æternam mortem his qui non renascuntur per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum. Damnant Pelagianos, qui negant peccatum originis, et sentiunt defectus illos seu concupiscentiam esse res indifferentes seu pænas tantum, nec esse res sua natura damnatas," &c.—Confess. August. Art. fid. præcip. Art. 2. In Corp. et Synt. Confess., Ed. 1612.

[2] "Est itaque peccatum originis, et propter lapsum primorum parentum et propter hanc depravationem quæ lapsum secuta est, nascentes reos esse iræ Dei et dignos æterna damnatione, nisi fiat remissio propter Mediatorem. . . . . Hanc totam depravationem dicimus esse peccatum, non tantum pænam peccati et rem indifferentem . . . . Vitandæ sunt in Ecclesia ambiguitates. Ideo expressè nominamus hæc mala depravationem, quæ sæpe ab antiquis scriptoribus nominatur mala concupiscentia. . . . . Hanc malam concupiscentiam dicimus esse peccatum: et adfirmamus hanc totam doctrinam de peccato, sicut in Ecclesiis nostris proponitur et declaratur, perpetuum esse veræ Ecclesiæ Dei consensum."—Confess. Saxon. Art. 2. In Corp. et Synt. Confess., Ed. 1612.

[3] See his "Orth. and Cath. Doctr. of our Lord's Hum. Nat." p. 18.

Mr. Irving may assert, as strongly as he pleases, that he holds the perfect sinlessness and holiness of Christ, but this can satisfy none, when in the same breath he denies that to be sin which we reckon sin. For him and his party, therefore, to tell us that we misrepresent him, when we say that he makes Christ a sinner, for that he asserts his perfect holiness as much as we do, is itself a misrepresentation, made to appear plausible only by his misuse of the word holiness. His ideas of holiness are not those of the Christian church, and the man whom he, in his lax interpretation of the law of God, would call holy, the Christian church reckons a sinner.

We must not, however, pass from this part of the subject without adverting to those direct testimonies which Scripture bears to the total absence of every thing which could be called sinful in the person of our Lord. The language of Scripture is as explicit upon this point as could be desired.

When the angel predicted his birth to Mary, he said, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee. *Therefore*, also, that *holy thing* which shall be born of thee (το γεννωμενον αγιον) shall be called the Son of God." (Luke i. 35.) Words cannot be more express to prove that the whole person of Jesus was free, in every respect, and in all its parts, from every thing that could be called sinful.

Again; the apostle, in his epistle to the Hebrews, tells us, that he was "without sin." (Heb. iv. 15.) But the same apostle, in his epistle to the Romans, asserts, as we have seen, that natural concupiscence is sin. The necessary conclusion is, that Christ is free from that natural concupiscence. Further on, in the same epistle, he says, that our Lord "offered himself up, *without spot*, to God." (Heb. ix. 14.) And St. Peter still more strongly expresses the same truth; "Ye are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb *without blemish and without spot*." (1 Pet. i. 19.) But could he be a *spotless* victim, and *without blemish*, if his human nature was tainted with corruption, and sinful like ours?

Further; mark our Lord's own words respecting him-

self, shortly before his final sufferings; "The prince of this world cometh and *hath nothing in me*" (εν εμοι ουκ εχει ουδεν.) (John xiv. 30.) Would Satan have had nothing in our Lord to aid his efforts, if our Lord's human nature was itself tempting him to sin, and causing evil thoughts and inclinations to rise up within him?

Nay, we have still stronger expressions on this subject. St. Paul tells us, that he "*knew no sin*," (τον μη γνοντα ἁμαρτιαν,) "had no *knowledge* of sin." (2 Cor. v. 21.) These words, as it appears to me, are sufficient *of themselves* to overthrow the whole fabric which Mr. Irving has reared. They might, in fact, be properly translated so as to give a direct contradiction to Mr. Irving's very words on this subject, viz. that our Lord "had NO evil consciousness;" and he who can reconcile this text with the supposition that our Lord was "conscious of, and troubled by, every evil disposition which inhereth in the fallen manhood,"—which, indeed, he must have been, if he took that fallen manhood in its corrupt state,—is (as is to be feared *is* the case with Mr. Irving and some others of the party) far beyond the reach of argument. The advantage of the supposed prophetic revelations, in this respect, to the cause of fundamental error is manifest, for their testimony, being received as the voice of God, is considered as of equal authority with the written word; and so the two must somehow or other be *made* to agree.

I will add but one passage more, and that quite sufficient *of itself* to determine the matter. "*In him*," says St. John, "*is no sin*," (ἁμαρτια εν αυτω ουκ εστι,) "*sin is not in him*." (1 John iii. 5.) If then, as St. Paul tells us, natural concupiscence is sin, this natural concupiscence is not in him. The expression here used cannot be limited to actual sin. It refers more especially to the *constitution* of the person of whom it speaks. Sin is not IN him.

There is also another consideration of great weight in determining this matter, viz. that the holiness of Christ so extended to the flesh he assumed, that that flesh was not allowed to see corruption. (See Ps. xvi. 10, and Acts ii.

31.) Now, Mr. Irving acknowledges that on his scheme our Lord could not avoid death as the punishment due to that corrupt nature he assumed. Hence, according to him, our Lord's human nature was so corrupt that it could not escape death, and yet was so thoroughly holy, that it was not allowed to suffer decay.

Again; it is evident, and as we have seen avowed by Mr. Irving, that upon his scheme it was impossible for our Lord, after having assumed human nature, to avoid death. If his human nature was sinful, and therefore, like ours, under the curse, the threatened punishment must be executed against it. Compare, then, with this doctrine, the following declaration of our Lord *after his incarnation.* "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man [no *one*, ουδεις] taketh it from me, but I lay it down *of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.*" (John x. 17, 18.) Can words be more express to show the *sovereign* power which our Lord had *at that time* over his own life? Mark the explanation to which Mr. Irving is forced. "The true meaning," he says, "of our Lord when he saith, 'I have *liberty* to lay down my life, and *liberty* to take it up again,' is, that he, having faith in the promises made to him by God, knew that he would be enabled to lay down his life at the time God required it of him, and that when he had done so, he would have liberty to take it up again by the resurrection." (Orth. and Cathol. Doctr. of our Lord's Hum. N. p. 94)!! Upon this explanation it is quite unnecessary to offer any remark. I shall only add, therefore, that the same truth so clearly stated in the text quoted above, may be gathered from many other passages of Scripture, which evidently show that Christ's death was a *voluntary* surrender of his life, by one who had the power of life and death in his own hands. (See Is. liii. 12; Matt. xx. 28; John xix. 30; &c.)

Having thus considered the doctrine which Mr. Irving has laid down as the foundation of his system, I now pro-

ceed to notice *the consequences* which avowedly flow from it. Although, according to Mr. Irving's views, Christ could be perfectly holy while his human nature had the proclivity to sin that dwells in us, yet he himself cannot help seeing that the notion of his having taken up sinful flesh entirely overthrows, in all its essential points, that system of Christian doctrine which is received by the orthodox catholic Church of all names and parties. If the error itself is absurd and blasphemous, the consequences to which it leads are no less awful and dangerous.

From Mr. Irving's views of the human nature of Christ, it follows, as he himself states,—That after having taken human nature, he could not avoid the sufferings and death he endured;[3] and, consequently—That his sufferings and death were the natural and necessary consequence of that condition of being in which he himself was found, and not a punishment inflicted upon him *solely* for our sins, and borne by him for us *solely* as our substitute.

These two statements, then, we assert to be directly contrary to the testimony of Scripture; and the latter of them, in particular, altogether subversive of that doctrine of the atonement which is delivered to us in the word of God.

The first is expressly overthrown by our Lord's own declaration *during his incarnation*, already quoted; "I lay down my life for the sheep. No man [no one] taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself; I have *power* to lay it down, and I have *power* to take it again." (John x. 17, 18.) The misinterpretation of this passage given by Mr. Irving has been quoted above, in the preceding page, and needs no remark.

The first of these assertions, then, being disproved, the second *necessarily* falls with it. If our Lord had his sufferings and death completely in his own power, then it follows that there was nothing *in him* for which those suf-

[3] "To reach death, there is no other way but by coming in the nature of a sinful creature; in that nature which, having sinned, did underlie the curse of death. If with his holy person he inform this nature, he may die, nay, HE MUST DIE." (Orth. and Cath. Doctrine, &c. p. 91.) There are many other similar passages.

ferings were due, and, consequently, that he endured them, not as being himself brought into the condition of a sinner (to use Mr. Irving's phrase) but ONLY as a substitute for sinners. It is important to observe this, because nothing can be clearer than the proof of his power in this respect in the passage of Scripture just quoted; a proof confirmed by the phraseology in other passages to which we have already referred, viz. Is. liii. 12; Matt. xx. 28; John xix. 30; &c.

But the second assertion is so important, as directly affecting the very foundation upon which the hopes of a fallen world are built, that we will consider it by itself.

It is to be observed that Mr. Irving does not deny that Christ bare our sins, because it is expressed in so many words in Scripture, but he asserts what is contradictory to it, viz. that *he also himself* was in a condition of being in which he could not escape the penal consequences of the Fall. This enables him to retain the form without the vitality of orthodox theology. He can expatiate in his system upon the sacrifice of Christ being vicarious, and his being a substitute for us, and so on; while he has thrown into it a poison that corrupts the whole, by holding that the sufferings of Christ sprang naturally and necessarily out of that condition of being in which he was found, his human nature needing an atonement as much as ours; and so the whole doctrine of the atonement is annihilated, and, as we shall see presently, a wild fiction, a scheme equally opposed to Scripture and reason, generated in Mr. Irving's imagination, put in its place.

The glory of the Gospel, the foundation of the sinner's hope, is that "Christ was *once offered to bear the sins of many*," (Heb. ix. 28): that he "gave himself a *ransom for* all," (ΑΝΤΙΛΥΤΡΟΝ ὑπερ παντων), (1 Tim. ii. 6): that he "came to give his life a ransom for many," (λυτρον ΑΝΤΙ πολλων), (Matt xx. 28); where the word translated *for* denotes *substitution:* that he "bare *our* sins in his own body on the tree," (1 Pet. ii. 24): that, in the language of the prophet, he was "wounded *for our* transgressions and bruised *for our* iniquities, the chastisement of *our* peace was upon

him, and with his stripes we are healed," (Isa. liii. 5); and that he "gave himself *for us* an offering and a sacrifice *to God* for a sweetsmelling savour," (Eph. v. 2); which sacrifice *voluntarily* made by Christ was a sacrifice appointed and accepted by God *for our sin*, for "the Lord hath *laid on him* the iniquity of us all,"—"it pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grief," and made "his soul *an offering for sin*." (Isa. liii. 6, 10.)

It is clear, then, from these passages that the sufferings and death of Christ were a punishment voluntarily endured by him for us and for our sin, that we might be accepted by God. And it is difficult to conceive how any one can pretend to reconcile them with the idea that the sufferings and death of Christ were the consequence of the corrupt state of his own human nature, a punishment due to his human nature as much as to ours.

But Scripture is even yet more explicit on the subject. The following passages incontrovertibly prove that his sufferings and death were borne by him *solely* as our substitute, and as a punishment due not to him but to us, we being thereby saved from the punishment we deserved. "We are redeemed," says St. Peter, "with the precious blood of Christ *as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot*," (1 Pet. i. 18, 19); who "hath once suffered for sins, THE JUST FOR THE UNJUST, that he might bring us unto God." (1 Pet. iii. 18.) "God," says St. Paul, "hath made *him* to be sin [or, a sin-offering] for us, *who knew no sin*, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. v. 21.)

And this is rendered still more clear by a consideration of those typical victims and sacrifices offered under the law which prefigured the sufferings and death of Christ. The remission of sins through the punishment of one not under the curse, who stood *in the place* of the offender and suffered as a *substituted* victim, was in them clearly shadowed forth, especially in the scape-goat, (see Levit. xvi. 20—22); and the apostle, in his epistle to the Hebrews, has marked out very distinctly the close mutual correspond-

ence between the type and the antitype in those sacrifices and that which they prefigured. As *they* did not suffer for their own sin, or sinful condition, so neither did Christ. *His* blood was shed, like theirs, as a sacrifice appointed by God, a suffering of punishment for *our* sins, such as vindicated the Divine holiness in pardoning them.

It is the consolation of the believer, therefore, that the sacrifice of Christ as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot, free in every respect from the curse of the law, whose sufferings acquired from the union of the Divine with the human nature in his person an infinite value, and were appointed by the Triune Jehovah as the means of salvation to guilty man, will be accepted by God, when pleaded with him in faith, as a propitiation and atonement for his sins; and thus his guilty soul be looked upon by God with favour, and his person justified and accepted, for the sake of the sufferings and righteousness of Christ.

But if our Lord's human nature was itself sinful, like ours, and so under the curse, then his life was forfeited, and his death, as Mr. Irving very truly tells us, was inevitable, and therefore could not have been spoken of in such terms.

To hold, then, that the sufferings he endured were not a punishment inflicted upon him *exclusively* for *our* sins, but a consequence of that condition of being into which he came, is not only unscriptural but completely subversive of that sure and only ground of hope upon which Scripture teaches our faith to repose. The true doctrine of the atonement is wholly uprooted by it; and that, entirely to Mr Irving's satisfaction; for concerning that doctrine he thus expresses himself:—"The man who will put a fiction, whether legal or theological, a make-believe, into his idea of God, I have done with; he who will make God consider a person to be that which he is not, and act towards him as that which he is not, I have done with. Either Christ was in the condition of the sinner, was in that form of

[4] It is printed in the original in these two places "was not," but it is evidently a mistake of the press.

being towards which it is God's eternal law to act as he acted towards Christ, or he was not. If he was, then the point in issue is ceded, for that is what I am contending for. If he was not, and God treated him as if he had been so; if that is the meaning of their imputation and substitution, or by whatever name they call it, away with it, away with it from my theology for ever." (pp. 116, 17.) If the reader, then, had any doubt before, about the opposition of Mr. Irving's views of the atonement to those of the whole Christian Church in all ages, and their fearful unsoundness, this passage is more than sufficient to remove it. Of course, however, it is only consistent with the supposition that Christ took upon him sinful human nature, for in that case, as Mr. I. says, he "must die," and therefore the idea of his sufferings being inflicted only as the punishment due to *our* sin would be untenable. And it is worth noticing how he is here judged and convicted of error out of his own mouth. He says he has done with the man who will make God act towards a person as that which he is not. Well then, we both agree that God treated Christ as a sinner. I ask him, then, was he a sinner, or was he not? If he allows that he was, then I will add nothing to convict him of blasphemy; if he says that he was not, then, according to Mr. I., God would have been unjust to have treated him as such. Mark, then, the shifts (in most cases they would be called the disingenuous shifts) to which he resorts to get over this difficulty. "But," saith he, "it will be said, Christ was not a sinner. And is there not a fiction still in treating him as that which he was not? I say, though not a sinner, any more than a man, but very God, he came down into that *condition of being*, into that *region of existence*, into that *experience of God's action which is proper to a sinner;* and being there, he bore the storm, and strife, and tempest, and stern controversy, which there continually abideth." (p. 117.) Can he suppose that any sober-minded person will be deceived by these vain circumlocutions and sounding phrases? Of what purpose is it to talk about "conditions of being" and

"regions of existence," when the sole question is, was Christ a sinner, or was he not? Either Christ was a sinner, which his reasonings clearly make him; or if he was not, then, having been treated as such, Mr. I. may choose between charging God with injustice, or receiving that doctrine of imputation and substitution which he has thus profanely denounced. While denying the fact, that his doctrine makes Christ a sinner, his own language when carrying that doctrine out into its consequences, is continually equivalent to the assertion of it.

Mr. Irving then proceeds to inform us, that to suppose that the sufferings and death of Christ were a sacrifice offered to God to "procure God's favour," is a heathenish error, (p. 100,) such a supposition arises from "a most barbarous idea of God." (p. 98.) Atonement and redemption, he tells us, have no reference to God. No; "atonement and redemption are the names for the bearing of Christ's work upon the sinner, and have *no respect to its bearing upon the Godhead*, nor upon the Christ, the God-man." (p. 99.) In fact, the prospect of the incarnation made no difference in God's favour towards sinners. No, reader, to say that "Christ's sufferings" "procured God's favour," "representeth God as changeable and being changed, as having a different disposition towards me after the incarnation than before it, *in prospect of the incarnation, than not in prospect of it.*" (pp. 100, 101.)

Now, that God would have been essentially the same, and as perfect in love and mercy, if he had left us to perish in our sins and suffer from our wilful disobedience, I willingly allow; but the question is, whether the sufferings of Christ were the *mediate* cause of the *actings* of God's favour towards us, which when Mr. Irving denies, he contradicts the best tidings of the gospel; and the supposition that it makes God changeable, is a mere fiction of his own brain, which could not have arisen, had he even given himself the trouble to understand the system he is condemning, for its supporters hold as much as he can that the plan of redemption originated in the love of the Father, whose mercy

is *exercised* towards the sinner, on the condition of that expiatory sacrifice and perfect obedience to the law voluntarily rendered by Christ.

The question is, what the Godhead determined to be requisite to do honour to the injured attributes and broken law of God, that God might be just when accepting the penitent sinner. This question is to be determined, not as Mr. Irving has done, by carnal reasonings, and talking of its making God changeable, if we suppose that his love to us was produced by any thing out of himself, such as Christ's sufferings; but by ascertaining what Scripture informs us, that God, *in his love towards a fallen world*, deemed necessary, as a condition to the active display of that love; in order, while he opened the door of salvation to a fallen world, to show at the same time to all his creatures his abhorrence of sin, and determination to visit it with punishment. It is apparently upon this point very much that Mr. I.'s errors on this division of the subject have arisen; namely, his not drawing the distinction between the making Christ's sufferings the primary cause of the Father's love, and the making them the *mediate* cause of the active display of that love.

Scripture clearly tells us, then, that the sufferings and death of Christ were that which the Triune Jehovah determined upon as the most befitting, and certainly the most infinitely *gracious*, display that could be made of God's abhorrence of sin, and determination to visit it with punishment. *Hence* they became the *condition* and the *mediate cause* of the active exhibition of God's love in our salvation. This whole doctrine is, in the following few words of the apostle, very exactly declared. "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Whom God hath set forth *to be* A PROPITIATION through faith in his blood, *to declare his righteousness* for (διὰ) the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time *his righteousness*, that he might be *just*, and the *justifier*

of him that believeth in Jesus." (Rom. iii. 25, 26.) So St. John says, that he is "the *propitiation* for our sins," "God sent his son to be *the propitiation* for our sins." (1 John ii. 2. and iv. 10.) And the sufferings and death of Christ, by which the atonement was purchased, were *a sacrifice offered to God.* For Christ in his death "gave himself for us *an offering and a sacrifice to God*, for a sweet-smelling savour," (Eph. v. 2;) he "offered himself *to God*," (Heb. ix. 14;) he was slain and redeemed us to God by his blood. (Rev. v. 9.) This indeed is clearly proved by the animal sacrifices that were typical of his. They were rendered as offerings to God in expiation of sin, and to procure his favour. Hence we are said to be "bought with a price," (1 Cor. vi. 20, and vii. 23;) "redeemed with the precious blood of Christ." (1 Pet. i. 18, 19.) To whom, then, could this price be paid but to God? And for what but to "redeem us to God," and obtain for us his favour? St. Paul, indeed, distinctly tells us, "without shedding of blood is no remission." (Heb. ix. 22.)

Mr. Irving, then, may talk as he pleases about this making God a being who "loveth suffering," (p. 102,) and so on; but these are merely the unscriptural reasonings of the carnal mind, unwilling to submit to the declarations of the word of God—the bold errors of Pelagians and Socinians, and have never before perhaps been advanced, but by those who belonged to those parties; of whose errors they are an inseparable part. God does not delight in suffering, but nevertheless "God is angry with the wicked every day;" (Ps. vii. 11;) and "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness;" (Rom. i. 18;) and "*comes upon* all the children of disobedience;" (Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6; Ps. lxxviii. 31;) and hence we are "by nature the children of *wrath*:" (Eph. ii. 3:) his "judgment" is, that "they which commit such things are *worthy of death;*" (Rom. i. 32;) and "*it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation*" upon such. (2 Thess. i. 6.) The wrath of God, therefore, rested upon us, (Eph. ii. 3,)

and was removed only by the sacrifice rendered unto him by Christ. (Eph. v. 2.) Suffering is not merely the natural, but the *divinely-appointed*, consequence of disobedience. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Gen. ii. 17.) But it is no proof that God loves suffering that he punishes the sinner, or that before he will accept the sinner to his favour, he *requires* the punishment due to his sin to have been borne either in his own person or in that of a substitute. It is, indeed, a gratuitous act of mercy to accept a substitute. [5]

But the doctrine that the work of Christ was undertaken and accomplished as a satisfaction to divine justice for the sins of the world, that only foundation for the sinner's hope, is spoken of by Mr. I. in terms of abuse and scorn. It is part of "the stock-jobbing theology of the religious world;" "the atonement upon this popular scheme is made to consist in suffering, and the amount of suffering is cried up to infinity." (pp. 95, 6.) And now, reader, mark the reason why these sufferings have not the value we have been accustomed to attribute to them. "I utterly deny," says Mr. Irving, "that anything suffered but the human nature of Christ, and that could only suffer according to the measure of a man. . . . . Well, let these preachers—for I will not call them divines or theologians—broker-like, cry up their article; it will not do: IT IS BUT THE SUFFERINGS OF A PERFECTLY HOLY MAN, TREATED BY GOD AND BY MEN AS IF HE WERE A TRANSGRESSOR." So after all his protestations of considering Christ as God-man, he tells us that *his* sufferings were but the sufferings of *a perfectly holy man;* and thus the worst error of Socinianism is forced upon us by one who professes (and seems to suppose himself) to hold in abhorrence that primary and distinguishing tenet of Socinianism, upon which alone it can stand. The great mystery of godliness is, that God was manifest in the flesh, and that therefore the suf-

[5] His observations in p. 98, &c. are quite unaccountable. Has he yet to learn that the terms "wrath of God," and such like, are not meant to attribute human passions to God, but only certain modes of action similar to what such feelings produce among men, and are authorised by Scripture?

ferings of Christ were the sufferings of a God-man; that *God* hath purchased the Church with *his own blood.* (Acts xx. 28)[6]

But does he deny the meritoriousness of Christ's acts, or their being a satisfaction to God? Oh, no; these things are so clearly declared in Scripture, that somehow or other his system must have the appearance of containing them.

Accordingly, "there is an infinite meritoriousness in every act of Christ, if you knew how to look at it; but it does not consist in the act itself, which hath the finite limitations of *a man's* act, but in the coming out of the infinite plenitude and blessedness of the Godhead to do that act." They are meritorious, because they show the Divine love, grace, and mercy, " how far it can condescend even to sinners like us. But if Christ came not verily into the condition of the sinner, [*i. e.* took upon him fallen sinful human nature,] but only supposititiously and fictitiously, there is no love, there is no grace, there is no mercy shown to our condition of sinners, but only to that condition he came into." (p. 96, 7.) " The preciousness" of " Christ's action and passion" " in God's sight and in the sight of the creation," is, " that Godhead should love the creation so as to unite himself with it in a personal union—that Godhead should love the sinful creation so as not to despise the Virgin's womb," &c. (p. 102.) That is, God is to be defiled by taking upon himself a sinful human nature, filled with evil propensities, to show his love and mercy; and unless his human nature has as much intrinsic defilement as ours, his incarnation shows no love or mercy at all. (The reason being, that Mr. Irving's doctrine of the atonement would then be made void.) From this monstrous union,

[6] Nothing can more fully prove the unsound nature of Mr. Irving's views on this point than the passage already quoted from his " Orth. and Cath. Doct." where he calls it an " heretical doctrine" to maintain " that Christ's generation was something more than *the implantation of that Holy-Ghost life in the members of his human nature, which is implanted in us by regeneration.*" (p. 140.) All Mr. Irving's reasonings, in fact, are applicable only to the case of a man born in the ordinary way of generation, but supported from his birth in a peculiar way by the power of the Holy Spirit.

then, arises "God's satisfaction with this work of his Son." And all the scriptures that teach us that Christ's sufferings were accepted by God on our behalf, as a satisfaction which we were unable to offer, but which was due to the injured attributes of the Godhead for our disobedience and rebellion, are disposed of in the six following lines;—"And because suffering and death are with God the eternal *sign* of the sinner's estate, the sufferings and death of Christ are spoken of in Scripture so continually, to express God's satisfaction with this work of his Son, in condescending not to the unfallen but to the fallen, not to the sinless but sinful condition of the creature." (p. 102.) And "the continual presentation of Christ's sufferings as the price of God's love [acts of love to us] has done a world of mischief." (p. 103.) It is, indeed, allowed that "the atonement, with relation to the price, the ransom, or sacrifice, by which it was purchased . . . standeth in the death of the Son of God," which is explained by saying that his death was "the great and principal act of Christ's work in the flesh," (p. 90;) and so purchased the atonement *merely* by being the completion of his work of condescension, by which the two natures were "reduced into eternal harmony."

The sufferings of Christ, therefore, he tells us, have no effect in procuring for us God's favour; and the way in which they procure us salvation is this,—"The sufferings of Christ procure me salvation by giving me an object of faith in God's love in all extremities and under all conditions; and by giving me the proof that a person into my conditions brought, and in my conditions subsisting, may, through faith, be brought out victorious in every conflict." (p. 106.)

Mr. I.'s doctrine, then, on these points is just this; that Christ's acts and sufferings, *as it respects God's regard to them*, were very meritorious, as showing great condescension, and that, on that account, they afforded great satisfaction to God, and there the matter ends; for the doctrine that his death was not due to him personally, or that his sufferings were a voluntary *sacrifice unto God*

for a sweet-smelling savour, or obtained anything for us from God, or that in them He bare our sins, as the scape-goat bore the sins of the Israelites, so that God accepts the voluntary sacrifice made by one in all respects free from sin, corruption, and sinfulness of nature, *in the place* of that satisfaction due from man to God, is scouted as delusion. And *as it respects the benefit we derive* from those sufferings, they "procure me salvation by giving me an object of faith in God's love," (for God having loved Christ in a sinful human nature, there is no reason why he should not love us in the same,) and "by giving me the proof that a person into my conditions brought, may, through faith, be brought out victorious in every conflict," *i. e.* that Christ having had a sinful human nature, and yet been preserved from sin, we may be so too, and so be accepted by God.

What, then, it may be said, is Mr. Irving's scheme of redemption? What is this wonderful discovery which is to set aside all the received theology of the whole Christian church? For he boldly asserts,[7] that the truth, according to his views, has not been advanced for the last "1500 years and more," during which time the Church has been in utter darkness, out of which he thinks to lead it. We willingly agree with him that the Church has not held his views for 1500 years, and will give him more than three centuries in addition, for we affirm, and defy him to show the contrary, that the Church has never held them at all. His system, in fact, is a mere imaginary scheme, worked out by the bold conceptions of a fervid and imaginative mind, drawing its conclusions from its own reasonings, instead of the declarations of the word of God.

His views, then, are as follows.—He explains *atonement* to mean *merely* an *at-one-ment*,[8] or reconciliation of our

[7] See Fraser's Mag. for March and April, 1832.

[8] I need hardly observe that it is not about the use of the *word* atonement, that an objection is here taken. This is comparatively of little consequence, and if Mr. Irving chooses to limit his use of *the word* to that signification which he has here expressed, there can be no very great objection. But the

human nature with the Divine nature, which he supposes to have been effected by the Second Person in the Trinity taking upon himself human nature in its fallen and sinful state, and then constraining the human will to obey the Divine will in all things, and by this he supposes that God and man are brought into "eternal harmony." The atonement is not a reconciliation effected by the sacrifice of the God-man Christ Jesus upon the cross, but an at-one-ment of all men with God, from the human nature having been once united to the divine in the person of Christ, and in his person preserved from the commission of actual sin, and at last suffered to die. What effect this can have upon the state, character, or prospects of the rest of mankind, is utterly incomprehensible. That such a Being, uniting Godhead and manhood in one person, should bring *his own* human will to obedience, and conquer all its sinful motions, is by no means wonderful, but why God should look upon me, a sinner, both under the guilt of original and actual sin, with favour, because the Second Person in the Trinity took upon him the same nature as I have, and kept it from actual sin, is inconceivable. This Mr. Irving appears to see, and therefore he says, "But how, it may be said, is this an atonement for me? It seems to be no more than a bearing of the infirmities of his own human nature; it seems to be no more than a righteousness wrought in his own human nature for it. I answer, There is but one human nature; it is not thine, it is not mine, it is not his; it is the common unity of our being. Bare he the sins of human nature? he bare the sins of all men. Bare he the infirmities of human nature? he bare the infirmities of all men." (p. 95.) To bear the sins of human nature is a phrase capable, as Mr. Irving well knows, of conveying different meanings. In one sense it is used by the Church as much as by Mr. Irving, viz. that Christ bare the sins of men, as the scapegoat bore the sins of the Israelites, that is, by imputation,

question is respecting that *doctrine* which divines have attached to this word and on which account the word is used in Scripture in those places which involve this doctrine, and which *doctrine* Mr. Irving wishes to reduce to his use of the *word*.

and *thus* bare the sins of all men. But the meaning of the phrase, as used here by Mr. Irving, is, that he took upon him, or had in his own person, sinful human nature, and therefore the conclusion that "he bare the sins of all men," must be understood in the same sense, which is nothing more or less than pure nonsense, for though if he had our sinful nature, he might have had sins of the same kind as ours, he could not have had in his own person all our sins otherwise than by imputation. Mr. Irving talks, in another place, of his bearing our sins, as the child may be said to bear the iniquities of his fathers, when he is visited with any of the consequences of them; but (not to mention that this would limit his sufferings to those arising from the sins of his own progenitors after the flesh) does Mr. Irving suppose that the father is *freed from punishment*, or at peace with God, because the child suffers for his iniquities? Was Adam saved from punishment, or looked upon with greater favour by God, through his descendants suffering for his iniquities? The only point in which we are concerned is, whether Christ *so* bore our sins as that he bore the punishment due to them, and thus saved us from it, and brought us into favour with God when we were "by nature children of wrath." He could not *thus* bear our sins by being merely brought into a community of being with us. The idea, therefore, of his bringing into a state of favour and reconciliation with God all those *persons* that bear human nature, by his bringing *his own* will and natural inclinations into a state of submission and obedience to the Divine will, is, on the face of it, absurd and utterly opposed to Scripture. This, however, according to Mr. Irving, is the mean of bringing the whole human race out of that state of alienation and guiltiness to which they were reduced by the Fall, and transferring them to a state in which they are *at one* with God.

And if he seeks to apply this only to those, who, being united to Christ by faith, have power from him to bring their own corrupt will into obedience to the will of God, then is he still forgetting (or what is worse, *denying*) that it

is "a righteous thing with God" to punish sin, and that, therefore, there can be no access to, or reconciliation with, him, as it respects *any* of our fallen race, until the law and justice of God have been magnified, in the infliction and the endurance of the punishment due to us.[9]

Penitent sinner, feeling the painful alienation from God to which sin has brought you, conscious of the wrath of God against you as the child of a fallen parent—feeling a law in your members that when you would do good evil is present with you, bending under the burden of many actual sins, here is the consolation offered you. God once took upon himself the same nature you have, and kept it from actual sin, and by this union the two natures were reconciled, and if you believe in him you shall have strength given you such as to effect, that, as far as you are concerned, they shall remain so. But you will say, I have original sin, I have actual sins, to be pardoned. How can I hope, consistently with God's word, that he will let these pass unpunished, and accept me, without any expiatory offering having been presented to him, in honour of his injured attributes? Oh! replies Mr. Irving, I "pity" you for supposing that God wishes any punishment to be inflicted for sin. He is too merciful for anything of the kind. This is "a most barbarous idea of God." It is "the God of the natural man." (See pp. 98, 100, and 102, 3.) Reader, do *you* think God would be unjust in demanding as a mediate cause for the display of his mercy to a sinner, that either the sinner himself should suffer adequate punishment for his sin, or obtain a substitute who should suffer *for* him, and thus display the infinite *justice* of God? Will you resort to the supposition that the Second Person in the Godhead defiled himself with a human nature filled with evil propensities, to which he united himself so that the two natures formed *one person*, to account for that punishment which he *voluntarily* endured *for our sins*, and thereby

[9] It is worth remarking, also, how completely these views set aside the necessity of Christ's *intercession* for us with God, as Mediator.

made the most gracious as well as most glorious manifestation of God's hatred against sin? Oh! truly is it the figment of him who is the author of all sin, to abate man's hatred of it. Will you, then, rest your hope of salvation upon this broken reed—this unscriptural fiction of a wild imagination, opposed alike to Scripture and common sense? Nay, will you, for a moment, appear to countenance those who uphold such delusions?

We come, then, next to consider how men can realize the blessings derivable from this *at-one-ment* of their nature with the divine nature. "He who believeth," says Mr. Irving, "in the sacrament of baptism, as a seal of the New Testament, is united unto the Son by being united to his human nature; and being so united, I, a human person, acting in this flesh, made one with his flesh, and *having in it the same power of the Holy Spirit as was in his* do act faith even as he did, who brought himself into the very condition of a man." (p. 106.) And this assertion of our having *the same power* of the Holy Spirit as Christ had, is repeated still more distinctly in his Tract on the Day of Pentecost. "The baptism of the Holy Ghost," he there says, "doth bring to *every believer* the presence of the Father, and the power of the Holy Ghost, *according to that measure, at the least, in which Christ, during the days of his flesh, possessed the same.*" (p. 39.) That this is utterly opposed to Scripture, hardly needs a proof, for while the Spirit is possessed by Christ without measure, (John iii. 34; &c.) as must needs be, from the constitution of his person, his gifts are given to us by measure, and "as he will." (Eph. iv. 7, 16; Rom. xii. 3, 6; 1 Cor xii. 4, 8—11, 28—30.)

From this doctrine, then, united with the primary error of Christ's human nature having been sinful like ours, arises this consequence, namely, that *every believer can be, and is bound to be, as holy as Christ himself was.* This is a consequence which they not only do not deny, but put forth as one of the great cardinal truths of the gospel, and, more-

over add to it, that the believer ought to do *the same works that Christ did, and even greater.* "*Christ's holiness,*" says Mr. Irving, "*was like theirs,* [*i. e.* "his members,"] *wrought in the fallen creature by power of the Holy Ghost,* through that *faith* which joined Christ, acting as a human person, with the Godhead of the Father, out of which he [*i. e.* the Father] ever descended to act that gracious part;" (p. 135;) and "the acting of Godhead in him, which is the Father's acting, is altogether made void, unless we look upon Christ as standing in the condition of *needing to be saved,* and of having been *saved in virtue of his continual faith upon the Father.*" (p. 149.) Hence, in his Letters to Mr. Baxter, Mr. I. states his doctrine to be, "That as he [Christ] was holy in the flesh, so are we, through the grace of regeneration, brought to be holy, planted in a holy standing, the flesh dead to sin as his flesh was dead to sin, and that by the baptism of the Holy Ghost we are brought into the fellowship of his power and fulness to do the works which he also did, and *greater works than these.*"[1] "Concerning the holiness of the believer my testimony is, that he ought *never to be less holy, both in flesh and spirit, than Jesus was;* and that *the same power of God incarnate, which presented Christ's flesh and spirit holy, is bestowed upon the believer at baptism to present his flesh and spirit always holy through faith.* And every short-coming from holiness is not of necessity, nor of accident, nor of circumstance, but of positive will not to believe and not to receive the power of regeneration, which is the continuance unto us of the power of generation in Jesus. Wherefore we are called 'holy ones,' and 'sons of God,' as he was called 'the holy thing,' and 'the Son of God.' He kept the name of the Father and glorified it; we have not kept it, and therefore need continual atonement and intercession. Furthermore, concerning the baptism of the Holy Ghost, my testimony is, and ever hath been, that it is the indwelling of the Father in the members *after what manner he dwelt in the Head while on earth,* for the same

[1] Baxter's Narrative, p. 106.

ends, and for what other ends the Father may have to accomplish by his church until he comes."[2] According to this doctrine, then, the believer ought to be as perfect in *knowledge*, and *holiness*, and *the power of working miracles*, as Christ himself was when upon earth.

Mr. I. is, it must be confessed, peculiarly unfortunate in his "testimonies," and had we not his own witness to the contrary, we might well be tempted to conclude that they were the hasty productions of a moment of excitement, for they are not only false in themselves, but ever running counter to one another. Thus in the matter we are now considering, if our natures are just as good as the human nature of Christ himself, and we have *at least the same power* of the Holy Ghost dwelling in us, how is it that we *are not* just as holy as Christ was? Oh! saith Mr. I., this arises from our "positive will not to believe," &c. But then in this case our will must have a greater reluctance to believe than Christ's had, and our nature be more corrupt than Christ's human nature was, which is downright heresy with Mr. I., and destroys the very foundations of his system. He must therefore carry his conclusion one step further, and assert that all *true believers* are *actually* as holy as Christ was. The grounds upon which he has drawn his conclusion *force* him to go thus far, or to give it up altogether. With this chimæra I suppose it is not worth contending, as it needs only to be stripped of the gay covering Mr. I. has thrown over it, to die a natural death. But let it be observed by all who are inclined to embrace the tenets upon which it is founded, that it is a conclusion necessarily flowing from them, and that consequently all their hope of future salvation is made by it to rest upon their being able to give an answer in the affirmative to this question, *Am I as holy as Christ was when upon earth?* Mr. Irving's doctrine, therefore, leaves no hope but for those whose nature is brought into *complete* submission to and oneness with the divine nature; and thus completely subverts the doctrine of justification,

[2] Baxter's Narrative, pp. 124, 5.

for it makes the believer's acceptance with God to arise from his supposed holiness. Thus the whole system of gospel truth is laid in ruins.

It is quite true that *the standard* of holiness the believer should propose to himself is the perfect holiness of God himself. "Be ye holy for I am holy." But to suppose that the believer can reach that holiness while in his present state, in a nature propense to evil, is merely to show an ignorance of what perfect holiness is.

Look at the examples of the most eminent saints whose history is recorded in Scripture. Were they perfectly holy? Nay, "*there is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not.*" (Eccl. vii. 20.) And so the apostle tells his Galatian converts,—"The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; *so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.* But if ye be *led of the Spirit*, ye are not under the law." (Gal. v. 17, 18.) So that the victory is not always on the side of the Spirit even in one who is upon the whole "led of the Spirit." (See also Matt. xxvi. 41. Mark xiv. 38.)

It is objected that the exhortations we meet with in Scripture to become perfectly holy are only to be reconciled with the supposition that such perfection is practicable; but this argument falls at once when we recollect that the same exhortations were given under the Old Testament, (see Lev. xix. 2; xx. 6; Deut. vii. 6. &c.) when, confessedly, that baptism of the Holy Ghost, through which alone this perfection is supposed attainable, was not given.

Nay, it is objected that it would make God himself unjust if his law was such as made perfection unattainable by a spiritual man. But in this objection the change which man *brought upon himself* by the fall is totally lost sight of. God *created* man upright, and capable of remaining perfectly holy; but he fell and involved all his posterity in the guilt and infirmities brought upon him by his disobedience. All the great moral requirements of God, however, necessarily remained as immutable as God himself. Man's

inability to fulfil them is from himself. True, our Lord came to restore to man the Divine image. But the question is, when that restoration is *fully* completed,—when the full effect of his work is produced. This will not be till after the resurrection. "When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." (1 Cor. xiii. 10.) The uses of that law in our present state are, as St. Paul frequently intimates to us, rather to show us our shortcomings, and convince us of sin, than to show us what our holiness must be.

Alas! how painful is the consideration, that when the way of salvation revealed in the word of God is so plain that he who runs may read, men should allow themselves to be led astray by the wild vagaries of a heated imagination, or the perverse reasonings of a self-inflated mind; and thus removed from that tried, that only, foundation of hope upon which the whole Catholic Church has rested from the beginning.

Such are the consequences Mr. Irving himself deduces from his doctrine of the incarnation; and thus the great object in view is, not to inculcate any mere speculative views on that subject, but to undermine the doctrine of the atonement, and introduce that melée of absurdities and wild conceits which Mr. Irving would substitute in its place. There are many others that might be added, but it is not worth while entering further into the subject.

Much might be added also on the *contradictions*, *absurdities*, and *misuse of terms* by which Mr. Irving and his followers deceive themselves.

Thus a distinction is attempted to be drawn between Christ being peccable and his human nature being peccable. The very attempt shows an unsoundness on the doctrine of the incarnation. It implies a possibility of the human nature acting without Christ acting, which is the old Nestorian heresy, viz. giving a personality to the human nature.

Again; while it is said, "We die not for any sin of our own, but for Adam's sin; else why do children die,"

(p. 95,) and that Christ having taken fallen human nature "must die," it is still, as we have seen above, asserted that the guilt of Adam's sin did not rest upon Christ. If, however, Christ took that sinful human nature that was under the curse, and "sentenced to death," (p. 91,) he must have taken it under the guilt of Adam's sin. And though Mr. Irving denies this when speaking directly of it, yet at other times his views of the human nature of Christ produce necessarily an unconscious avowal of it. Thus he maintains that if Christ's human nature "differed by however little from ours, in its alienation and *guiltiness*," then the work of redemption is incomplete. [3]

The *misuse of theological terms* also is particularly to be noticed, because many are thus deceived as to the real nature of these doctrines when they see the same terms made use of as they have been accustomed to hear. We have already had a specimen of this in the sense in which the word *atonement* is used. So "*redemption* consisteth in

[3] Whether Mr. Irving is unconscious of these contradictions being involved in his doctrine, or indifferent to them, I know not; but probably the former is the case, for his own mind is manifestly in a state of confusion on the subject. He even uses the same word in different senses in parts of the same argument. This is particularly the case with the word *flesh*, the most important word in the whole subject. For instance, in his Treatise on the Human Nature of Christ, he says, "Is flesh such a lumpish thing? hath it no relations to the soul? who can tell how they are bound together? If I were asked whether of the two had the greater stroke in sin, I should certainly say the flesh: I mean *living, conscious flesh*;" &c. (p. 27.) As if there could be such a thing as *living, conscious flesh*, whose acts did not proceed from *the soul*. And this varying use of the word, making it stand sometimes for the material substance, at another for this substance animated and *conscious*, but still separate from the soul, and at another for body and soul together, and shifting the meaning according as it may suit his purpose, introduces, as may be supposed, the utmost confusion into his arguments. Mr. Irving truly says, "I am no polemic; I have neither the gift nor the inclination for it." (p. 141.) Why, then, I ask him, does he wage war against the whole Christian Church, and while he acknowledges his inability to defend the position he has taken up, denounce and excommunicate all who do not join him? If he feels, as he professes, that he has not had the power given him necessary to enable him to take such an elevated stand as to become the corrector of the whole Christian Church, why does he, in the same breath, lure others to their destruction by urging them, as they value their salvation, to repair to his standard?

delivering the human will out of bondage," and the way in which it is effected is this, "the Person of the Word did take a human will under those very bondages into union with himself; and acting therein did deliver it completely out of all those oppressions of the devil, the world, and the flesh;" so that Christ himself needed redemption as we do. (p. 89.) *Substitution* is, his human nature being considered as the substitute or representative of the whole human race, so that by his human nature being brought in all things into a state of obedience to his Divine nature, the whole human race were made *at one* with God. (See pp. 113, 117, &c.) And thus the *sacrifice* of Christ is the mortification of the evil propensities of his human nature, terminating in the death of that human nature. (pp. 13, 14, &c.) In this way are perverted all the terms in use among orthodox theologians, so that the uninstructed hearer, who knows not what are the real sentiments of the party, is led blindfold into the abyss prepared for him, and often has not his eyes opened till he is gone too far easily to recede. The mystic phraseology and grandiloquent harangues of Mr. Irving, the flowing periods of Mr. Erskine, the glowing effusions of Mr. Campbell, with the unearthly and impassioned vociferations of pretended prophets and prophetesses, are all employed in favour of the heresy; and form a power of machinery, which, compared with the power of resistance that can be opposed to it in many minds, is as the force of a wheel against a fly.

There is another consideration connected with this doctrine, showing its evil tendency, which I would earnestly commend to the notice of the reader, viz. that its reception necessarily prevents proper humiliation of heart for sin. For, by it that natural corruption which ought to be one of the strongest grounds for such humiliation, is declared not to be sin unless it be indulged. That the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, is, therefore, according to this doctrine, no ground for self-humiliation, for our Lord himself had it.

But I will proceed no further. There is a point at which

duty bids one stop in entering into such details even for the purpose of refutation; and nothing but the hope that the exhibition of these doctrines before the reader in their native deformity, divested of the tinsel trappings with which he may have been accustomed to see them adorned, might be instrumental in removing any doubts he may have entertained on the matter, could have induced me to go thus far into the subject.

But as the defenders of this heresy accuse those who reject it, of impugning the doctrine that Christ had our human nature, I will just add a few words on this point, in order to disabuse the minds of those who have been misled by this assertion. We hold as strenuously as they can that Christ had a human nature such as ours, and that he was "man of the substance of his mother." But inasmuch as Scripture also tells us that he "knew no sin," was "without sin," and that "in him was no sin," we hold that in all comparisons between him and us this scriptural exception to his likeness to us is to be taken into the account; nor does that exception in the least degree affect the question of his real incarnation, and that his human nature was "of the substance of his mother."

It will, I suppose, be allowed that all evil inclinations arise in the soul. The body may, through its infirmity, be an instrument in producing them, but evil consciousness and inclinations can only exist in the immaterial thinking part, or reasonable soul. That the human nature of Christ was under the physical infirmities of the fall, we have evidence in Scripture. If this is called sinful flesh, it must be called so, *as far as Christ is concerned,* with the careful recollection that in Christ it means only flesh reduced to that state of infirmity and susceptibility of suffering to which sin has brought it. Hence, not only was he temptible, or capable of being made a subject of temptation, from without, but also the physical infirmity of his own human nature subjected him to many temptations; a sense

of weariness was a temptation to rest, a sense of hunger was a temptation to him to obtain food; the prospect of death was painful to him; all these physical infirmities were sources of temptation. But we deny that they were, or could be, accompanied in him by any inclination, desire, proclivity, or tendency to sin, any inclination that needed to be resisted, or that God himself could not sanction. His soul was upheld from the *possibility* of having any evil consciousness, by its inseparable union with the Second Person in the adorable Trinity. Even the agony in the garden was unaccompanied by any wish of avoiding the sufferings that he foresaw were coming upon him. His language shows the most perfect resignation to the Divine will.

The physical infirmity of the flesh, also, increased the force of the temptations from Satan and the world. In the scene in the wilderness, after our Lord had fasted for some time, there was no doubt an animal craving for food. This, therefore, when the tempter offered him the means of gratifying it, was a temptation to him. His hunger was a pressure upon him which he had the power of removing. I ask, then, was there in him, or any part of him, *an inclination to yield to the temptation, to be overcome?* There would have been in us. Was there in him? On Mr. Irving's hypothesis there would have been. Was he, then, on such an hypothesis, free from sin? —So in the temptation from the offer of worldly riches, &c. there was *a knowledge* that they would procure him the means of alleviating any pressure of bodily cravings or infirmities, and obtaining bodily gratification, and exalting him in the eyes of the world. Was this knowledge, then, accompanied, as it would have been in us, with any secret inclination to possess them, to be overcome? If so, then, *even if he crushed it in its birth*, he was a sinful being.

Was, then, his human soul different from ours? It was *not* in *nature* or *essence*, but it clearly was in *circumstance;* and this is as reconcileable with the assertion that it was our human nature which he took, as is the doctrine of the re-

newal of the soul of the believer by the Holy Spirit with the assertion that the believer's nature is the same as that of the unbeliever; for the difference between the human soul of Christ and that of fallen man is the same in *character*, though very *very* far from being the same IN DEGREE, with that which exists between the soul of the believer and that of the unbeliever. It is the same in nature or essence, but not the same in circumstance. And this circumstantial, or, as it is called by logicians, accidental, difference arises from the miraculous conception and wonderful constitution of the person of Christ. Not to enter upon any metaphysical discussion on the origin of the soul, I shall briefly remark that the words of the angel to Mary, " The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee--*therefore* also that *holy thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," clearly prove that the human soul of Christ was made pure by God. Its perfect union, indeed, with the divine nature in his person ensures its purity, because the two natures were so united as to form but one person.

The essential unsoundness of Mr. I.'s creed on the doctrine of the incarnation is proved by this one circumstance, that he is continually identifying that which took place in Christ with that which takes place in us; entirely forgetting that in Christ the divine and human natures were so united as to form only *one person;* whereas in us what takes place arises from the actings of the Holy Spirit upon *another person.* Indeed all Mr. Irving's reasonings are reconcileable only with this hypothesis, that what was done by Christ was done by a Divine Power acting in him, as an agent separate from his own person,—which was the principal ground upon which the Fathers condemned Nestorius.

But it is said that if this view of the matter be correct, Christ was not " in all points tempted like as we are," for he was not tempted by evil inclinations, and therefore that this view overthrows all the comfort and encouragement to be derived from the doctrine of the sympathy of Christ. Now,

observe the unavoidable consequence of this reasoning. If it be necessary that Christ should have had evil inclinations to contend with, in order to know the strength of the temptations that assail us, then is it necessary that he should have committed actual sin; for it will not be denied, that the strength of the temptation to commit a sin, which has been for some time habitually indulged, is much greater than such a temptation when the sin has never been indulged. Every *actual* sinner, therefore, must despair of obtaining the sympathy of Christ in the temptations that assail *him*. He must say, Christ cannot sympathize with me, for he never committed sin, and therefore cannot know how strong *my* temptations are. To make out this doctrine, then, that Christ could not sympathize with us, unless he had been in all respects circumstanced as we are, it must be affirmed, that Christ had evil *habits*, as well as evil *inclinations*; for, if this doctrine were true, he could not sympathize with a man who, after a long life of indulgence in sin, is tempted to repeat his sins, unless he had himself committed sin in the same way.

Where, then, it may be asked, are we to place the limit to the temptations by which he was assailed? I reply,—Where Scripture places it. As he "knew no sin," and "in him was no sin," so no temptations that proceed from sin, either inherent or actual, could have assailed him. Nor is this at all opposed to the declaration that he was "in all points tempted like as we are." For, as we have already observed, he might be assailed by all the temptations arising from the animal cravings of the body, the physical infirmities of the soul, the suggestions of Satan, outward circumstances and the display of worldly things suited to the gratification of the human nature. He might become conscious, therefore, in his own person, of the force and pressure of all these temptations, that is, of all our temptations, except so far as our own sinful nature *aggravate* them with accompanying evil inclinations, or originate others *of a similar kind*. He might therefore

be tempted *in all points* like as we are, without having any temptations to contend with from this source; for all *possible* temptations might be supplied from the other sources we have enumerated. And such, indeed, are expressly excepted in the scripture we are now considering, for its words are, he "was in all points tempted like as we are, *yet without sin.*" This certainly excludes those evil inclinations that are themselves sinful. Such motions of the natural mind, indeed, can be called temptations to sin, only as many other sins may be so called, viz. from their leading to sin, but not as if they themselves were sinless.

Whether, therefore, the sympathy of Christ would have been stronger if he had *had* a sinful human nature, is a question into which it appears to me quite unnecessary, and something worse than unnecessary, to enter. I cannot for a moment suppose him to have had it, because Scripture asserts the contrary. And if it is a mere human fancy that the sympathy of Christ would have been greater if he had been what Scripture tells us he was not, it is an idle fancy not worth refuting, for argument could have no effect upon those who indulged it. It is quite manifest that if he "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin," he can be "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," which is all that Scripture asserts, and all that is necessary for our encouragement; with which, therefore, we may well rest satisfied, without aiming to be wise above what is written, which is the very rock upon which our modern prophets are making shipwreck.

The assertion that temptations to sin are no temptations to one who has no propensity or inclinations to sin to second them, is contradicted by this one fact, that *such* persons have *fallen* under those temptations. The pressure of the besieging temptation is not less because there is nothing within to give it admission into the soul. The governor of a fortress (if I may be allowed the illustration) that had been fiercely besieged, but was prepared at every point of attack, and had none within to aid his assailants, would know full well how to sympathize with the commander of

one that, when similarly attacked, had no sufficient power of resistance, and also had a betrayer within its own walls.

Moreover, many of the temptations that assailed the human nature of our Lord arose from the infirmities of that nature, so that in fact he was placed in a far more trying situation than Adam was when he *fell*. Those infirmities caused our Lord to *suffer* when tempted, which surely greatly increased the force of the temptation. Who can tell, for instance, the pressure of bodily suffering arising from a forty days' abstinence from food? And when we recollect that those sufferings were by his own free will carried far beyond what any mere man ever endured, and united with others arising from the malice of Satan, nay, from an immediate divine infliction, such as at one period to leave his human nature under a sense of God's desertion of it, can we dream for a moment that he is unable to sympathize with us, or incapable of appreciating the situation in which our infirmities place us?

The charge, therefore, against us of invalidating the doctrine of Christ's sympathy, is as untrue as that which accuses us of maintaining that Christ's human nature was not the same as ours.

The fact is, that the inherent proclivity to sin existing in our fallen nature is not of the substance or essence of that nature in itself, but only an accident connected with it by propagation in all the *natural* descendants of Adam, but from which Christ was preserved by his *supernatural* generation. All the sinless weaknesses that were the consequences of the fall he took; that is, all those physical infirmities that subject man to suffering, and expose him to temptation. But our *moral* infirmities he had *not*. To affirm that any soul generated as our Lord's, and *so* connected from the first moment of its existence to a Divine Being as that the two were united in *one person*, could have any taint or proclivity to sin, is not merely a blasphemous assertion, but one that is utterly irreconcileable with any correct idea of the constitution of such a Person.

ERRATA AND ADDENDA.

P. 12. l. 9. For *Humanity* read *Human Nature.*

P. 89. l. 34. For *perons* read *persons.*

P. 181. l. 29, 30. "Marion Cavalier and Fage." Mr. Smedley, in his third vol. of the History of the Reformed Religion in France, just published as this sheet is passing through the press, in an obliging notice of the account given in this volume of the French and English prophets, has, I see, the following observation;—"Mr. Goode speaks, however, far too favourably of the contemporary reputation of the three leading prophets. The charges imputed against them may be false, but they are accused of very revolting atrocities in the *Nouveaux Mémoires.*" (p. 308.) This, however, as Mr. S. will see on referring again to the account I have given, is a mistake; for the fact is, I myself have said *nothing* as to *their* "contemporary reputation," as distinguished from the *others.* I have said (p. 179) of the inspired in the Cevennes *generally,* that their "external moral and religious character" was "eminently irreproachable," in which I am borne out by all the accounts given of them; and respecting which I have given a quotation from Lacy's Preface to the "Cry," in which *he* speaks highly of the moral character of those three individually. But certainly the testimony he there bears respecting them, particularly that part of it that proves that even "the Savoy Consistory" "laid nothing of immorality to their charge," and "imputed nothing of that kind to them," especially when connected with the fact that in their subsequent prosecution as false prophets they were still left free from any such charge, and with Dr. Woodward's remarks (given above, p. 193), is, to my mind, quite sufficient to outweigh any anonymous accusation of "very revolting atrocities;" and surely such evidences as these form the most proper test of their "contemporary reputation." I have pleasure, however, in referring to Mr. Smedley's volume for further information respecting these prophets.

THE END

LONDON
IBOTSON AND PALMER, PRINTERS, SAVOY STREET, STRAND.

Date Due

Ap 26 45

V 8 '45

Ap 5 '46

APR 2 1969

JUN 15 1972

MAY 2 [illegible]

JAN 14 '74

JAN 21 '84

JUL 2 [illegible]

MAR 11 1999

MAY 24 2007

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01019 1122